Mr Hale

A

HISTORY

OF THE

Apoſtles and Evangeliſts,

Writers of the

NEW TESTAMENT:

IN WHICH

The Evidences of the Genuinneſs of the four Goſpels, the Acts of the Apoſtles, the Epiſtles, and the Book of the Revelation, and the Times when they were writ, are repreſented in a Light ſuited to all Capacities.

WITH

REMARKS and OBSERVATIONS

UPON

Every Book of the New Teſtament, uſeful for all, who deſire to underſtand the CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

By *NATHANIEL LARDNER*. D.D.

The Second Edition.

LONDON:

Printed for J. BUCKLAND, and W. FENNER, in Pater-noſter-row; J. WAUGH, in Lombard-ſtreet; P. DAVY, and B. LAW, in Ave-mary-lane; and T. FIELD, in Cheapſide. 1760.



A

HISTORY

OF THE

Apoſtles and Evangeliſts,

Writers of the

NEW TESTAMENT.

VOL. I.

Containing general Obſervations upon the Canon of the New Teſtament, and a Hiſtory of the four Evangeliſts, with the Evidences of the Genuinneſs of the four Goſpels, and the Acts of the Apoſtles, the Times, when they were writ, and Remarks upon them.

By *NATHANIEL LARDNER*. D. D.

The Second Edition.

LONDON:

Printed for J. BUCKLAND, and W. FENNER, in Pater-noſter-row; J. WAUGH, in Lombard-ſtreet; P. DAVY, and B. LAW, in Ave-mary-lane; and T. FIELD, in Cheapſide. 1760.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I. Page.

GENERAL Denominations of the Collection of ſacred Books, received by Chriſtians. 1

CHAP. II.

General Obſervations upon the Canon of the New Teſtament. 21

CHAP. III.

Of the Method, in which the Canon of the New Teſtament has been formed. 47

CHAP. IV.

Of the Time of writing the Goſpels, eſpecially, the firſt Three. 59

CHAP. V.

St. Matthew, Apoſtle, and Evangeliſt. 86

CHAP. VI.

Of the Time, when the Apoſtles left Judea, to go and preach the Goſpel in other countreys. 128

CHAP. VII.

St. Mark, Evangeliſt. 155

CHAP. VIII.

St. Luke, Evangeliſt. 209

CHAP. IX.

St. John, Apoſtle, and Evangeliſt. 315

CHAP. X.

The Queſtion conſidered, whether any one of the firſt three Evangeliſts had ſeen the Goſpels of the others, before he wrote. 455

A PLAN

A Plan of the Times and Places of writing the four Goſpels, and the Acts of the Apoſtles.

GOSPELS &c.	PLACE.	*A. D.*
St. Matthew's.	Judea, or near it.	about 64.
St. Mark's.	Rome.	.... 64.
St. Luke's.	Greece.	....63. or ....64.
St. John's.	Epheſus.	.... 68.
The Acts of the Apoſtles.	Greece.	.... 63. or ....64.

A SUP-

A HISTORY OF THE Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, Writers of the NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAP. I.

General Denominations of the Collection of ſacred Books, received by Chriſtians.

I. *Scripture.* II. *Bible.* III. *Canon.* IV. *Old and New Teſtament.* V. *Inſtrument.* VI. *Digeſt.* VII. *Goſpel.*

I. ONE of the general denominations of ſacred books is *Scripture*, or *Scriptures*, literally, and primarily ſignifying writing. But by way of eminence and diſtinction the books in higheſt eſteem are called *Scripture*, or *the Scriptures*. *Scripture.*

This word occurs often in the New Teſtament, in the Goſpels, the Acts, and the Epiſtles. Whereby we perceive, that in the time of our Saviour and his Apoſtles this word was in common uſe, denoting the books received by the Jewiſh People, as the rule of their faith. To them have been ſince added by Chriſtians the writings of Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, compleating the collection of books, received by them as ſacred and divine.

Some of the places, where the word *Scripture* is uſed in the ſingular number for the books of the Old Teſtament, are theſe. 2 Tim. iii. 16. *All ſcripture is given by inſpiration of God.* And Luke iv. 21. John ii. 22. Acts i. 16. viii. 32. 35. Rom. iv. 3. Gal. iii. 8. James ii. 18. 23. 1 Pet. ii. 6. 2 Pet. i. 20. *Scriptures*, in the plural number, in theſe following, and many other places. Matth. xxi. 42. xxii. 29. xxvi. 54. Luke xxiv. 27. 32. 45. John v. 39. Acts xvii. 2. 11. xviii. 24. 28. 2 Tim. iii. 15. 2 Pet. iii. 16.

St. *Peter* applies this word to the books of the New, as well as of the Old Teſtament, to St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, in particular. 2 Pet. iii. 16. . . *as alſo in all his epiſtles . . which they that*

that are unlearned, wreſt, as they do alſo the other ſcriptures, unto their own deſtruction. Plainly denoting, that * St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles are *Scriptures* in the higheſt ſenſe of the word.

II. *Bible* is another word, which has now been long in uſe among Chriſtians, denoting the whole collection of writings received by them, as of divine Authority. *Bible.*

The word, primarily, denotes book. But now is given to the writings of Prophets and Apoſtles by way of eminence. This collection is *the Book*, or *Bible*, the book of books, as ſuperior in excellence to all other books. The word ſeems to be uſed in this ſenſe by *Chryſoſtom* in a paſſage already *(a)* cited. "I therefore exhort all of you to "procure to yourſelves *Bibles*, βιβλία. If "you have nothing elſe, take care to have "the New Teſtament, particularly, the "Acts of the Apoſtles, and the Goſpels, "for your conſtant inſtructors." And *Jerome* ſays, "That *(b)* the Scriptures being

* Hac parte (quod bene notandum eſt) Petrus canonizat, ut ita loquar, id eſt, in canonem ſacrarum ſcripturarum aſcribit, atque canonicas facit epiſtolas Pauli. Dicens enim, *ſicut & ceteras ſcripturas*, utique ſignificat, ſe etiam illas in ſcripturarum numero habere. De ſacris autem ſcripturis eum loqui, in confeſſo eſt. *Eſt. in loc.*

(a) Vol. X. p. 349. *(b) The ſame. p.* 158.

" all writ by one Spirit, are called one book. We likwiſe ſaw formerly a paſſage of *Auguſtin*, where he informs us, " That *(c)* " ſome called all the canonical ſcriptures " one book, on account of their wonderful " harmonie, and unity of deſign through- " out." And I then ſaid: " It is likely, that this way of ſpeaking gradually brought in the general uſe of the word *Bible*, for the whole collection of the ſcriptures, or the books of the Old and New Teſtament."

In ſhort, the ancient Chriſtians were continually ſpeaking of *the Divine Oracles*, and *the Divine Books*, and were much employed in reading them, as *Chryſoſtom* directs in a paſſage, tranſcribed *(d)* below: where he recommends the reading the divine books daily, forenoon and afternoon. At length the whole collection was called *the book*, or *the Bible*.

Dr. *Heumann* has *an Epiſtle*, or ſhort Diſſertation *(e)* concerning the origin of this name

(c) Vol. X. p. 256.

(d) Ἀλλὰ δεῖ πάντα καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον ἡγεῖσθαι πρὸς τὴν τῶν πνευματικῶν λόγων διάλεξιν. . . . . Δυνησόμεθα κἂν ἐπὶ οἰκίας διατρίβοντες, κἂν μετὰ τὴν ἐσίασιν, κἂν πρὸ τῆς ἐσιάσεως μετὰ χεῖρας λάβοντες τὰ θεῖα βιβλία τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν καρπεῦσθαι ὠφέλειαν. *In i. Gen. hom. x. T. 4. p.* 81. *C. Bened.*

(e) De origine nominis Bibliorum. *Heum. Poecile. Tom. i. p.* 412. . . 415.

name of our ſacred collection of books. And for ſome while he was of opinion, that *(f)* it was ſo called, as being the moſt excellent of all books: in like manner as the Jews had before called their collection *the Scriptures*, by way of eminence. So Acts xviii. 24. and 28. But *(g)* afterwards he ſuſpected, that the origin of this name was in thoſe words of *Paul*, 2 Tim. iv. 13. *The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comeſt, bring with thee, and the books.* καὶ τὰ βιβλία. For he believed, that thereby the ancient Chriſtians underſtood the ſacred code. But he afterwards acknowledgeth, that he had not found any inſtance of that interpretation in ancient writers. It ſeems to me therefore, that this conjecture ſhould be dropt, as deſtitute of foundation: and that it ſhould be better for us to adhere to the forementioned origin of this name, which appears to have in it a good deal of probability.

(f) Suſpicari deinde coepi, ideo *Biblia* dictum eſſe ſacrum codicem, quod tanquam liber omnium praeſtantiſſimus κατ' ἐξοχὴν dictus ſit τὰ βιβλία. Suppetias conjecturae huic ferre videbatur illa appellatio, qua idem divinum opus vocari ſolet αἱ γραφαί. e. gr. Act. xviii. 24. 28. *Id. ib. p.* 413.

(g) Ib. p. 414.

Canon.

III. *Canon* is originally a Greek word, ſignifying a rule or ſtandard, by which other things are to be examined and judged.

As the writings of the Prophets and Apoſtles and Evangeliſts contain an authentic account of the revealed will of God, they are the rule of the belief and practiſe of thoſe who receive them.

Sometimes *canon* ſeems equivalent to a liſt or catalogue, in which are inſerted thoſe books, which contain the rule of faith.

Du Pin ſays, "This *(h)* word ſignifies "not only a law or rule, but likewiſe a ta- "ble, catalogue, liſt. Some have ſuppoſed, "that the canonical books were ſo called, "becauſe they are the rule of the faith. But "though it be true, that they are the rule of "our faith; yet the reaſon of their being "called canonical, is, becauſe they are placed "in the catalogue of ſacred books."

Perhaps, there is no need to diſpute about this. For there is no great difference in thoſe

(h) Le mot ſignifie non ſeulement une loi, une regle, mais auſſi une table, un catalogue, une liſte.... Quelques-uns ont cru, que les livres canoniques étoient ainſi appellez, parcequ'ils ſont la regle de la foi. Mais quoique cela ſoit vrai, ce n'eſt pas ce qui leur a fait donner le nom de canoniques, qu'ils n'ont que parceque l'on a nommé canon le catalogue des livres ſacrez. *Diſſ. Prelim. l.* 1. *ch.* 1. §. *ii.*

thoſe two ſenſes. And there may be paſſages of ancient writers, where it would be difficult to determine, which of them is intended.

St. *Paul* has twice uſed the word *canon*, or rule. Gal. vi. 16. *As many as walk according to this rule.* Upon which verſe *Theodoret*'s comment is to this purpoſe: "He *(i)* "calls the forementioned doctrine a rule, as "being ſtrait, and having nothing wanting, "nor ſuperfluous." Again, ſays St. *Paul*, Philip. iii. 16. *Whereunto we have already attained, let us walk according to the ſame rule.* Where he ſpeaks of the doctrine of the goſpel in general, or of ſome particular maxim of it: not of any books, containing the rule of faith. However, his uſe of the word may have been an occaſion of affixing that denomination to the books of ſcripture. For it is of great antiquity among Chriſtians.

Irenaeus, ſpeaking of the ſcriptures, as the *words of God*, calls *(k)* them the *rule*, or

(i) Κανόνα ἐκάλεσε τὴν προκειμένην διδασκαλίαν, ὡς εὐθύτητι κοσμουμένην, καὶ μήτε ἐλλεῖπον τὶ, μήτε περιττὸν ἔχουσαν. *Theod. in loc.*

(k) Nos autem unum et ſolum verum Deum doctorem ſequentes, et regulam veritatis habentes ejus ſermones, de iiſdem

canon *of truth.* Here *canon* is not a catalogue, but the books, or the doctrine contained in the books of ſcripture.

Clement of *Alexandria*, referring to a quotation of the Goſpel according to the *Egyptians*, ſays with indignation: "But *(l)* they "who chooſe to follow any thing, rather "than the true Evangelical Canon, [or the "canon of the Goſpel,] inſiſt upon what fol-"lows there as ſaid to *Salome*." In another place he ſays: "The *(m)* eccleſiaſtical ca-"non is the conſent and agreement of the "Law and the Prophets with the teſtament "delivered by the Lord."

Euſebe, as *(n)* formerly quoted, ſays of *Origen*: "But in the firſt book of his Com-"mentaries upon the Goſpel of *Matthew*, "obſerving *(o)* the eccleſiaſtical canon, he "declares, that he knew of four Goſpels "only."

I ſhall

iiſdem ſemper eadem dicimus omnes. *Iren. l.* 4. *c.* 35. *al.* 69. *f. p.* 277.

(l) See Vol. ii. p. 529. *or* 527.

(m) Κανὼν δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἡ συνῳδία καὶ ἡ συμφωνία νόμε τε καὶ προφητῶν τῇ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίε παρεσίαν παραδιδομένη διαθήκῃ. *Cl. Strom. l.* 6. *p.* 676. *C.*

(n) Ch. 38. *vol. iii. p.* 235.

(o) . . . τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάτ]ων κανόνα. *Ap. Euſeb. l.* 6. *c.* 25. *p.* 226. *B.*

I ſhall add a few more paſſages from later writers, chiefly ſuch as have been already quoted in the foregoing volumes: to which paſſages therefore the reader may eaſily have recourſe.

Athanaſius (p) in his Feſtal Epiſtle ſpeaks of three ſorts of books, the *canonical*, the ſame, which are now received by us, ſuch as were *allowed to be read*, and then of ſuch as are *apocryphal:* by which he means books forged by heretics.

In the *Synopſis of Scripture*, aſcribed to him, but probably not writ till above a hundred years after his time, near the end of the fifth centurie, is frequent mention *(q)* of canonical and uncanonical books.

The Council of *Laodicea*, about 363. ordains, that *(q)* "no books, not canonical, "ſhould be read in the church, but only "the canonical books of the Old and New "Teſtament."

Rufin, enumerating the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, makes *(r)* three ſorts

(p) See vol. viii. p. 228. 229.
(q) See vol. viii. p. 243. . . 245.
(q) The ſame. p. 291.
(r) See vol. x. p. 187. 188.

ſorts of books, ſuch *(s)* as are *included in the canon*, ſuch as are *not canonical*, but *eccleſiaſtical*, allowed to be read, but not to be alleged for proof of any doctrine, and laſtly, *apocryphal* books, which were not to be publicly read.

Jerome likewiſe often ſpeaks of the canon of Scripture, as we ſaw in his chapter, where he ſays: "*Eccleſiaſticus*, *(t)* *Judith*, "*Tobit*, and *the Shepherd*, are not in the ca- "non:" and "that *(u)* the Church reads, or "allows to be read, *Judith*, *Tobit*, and the "*Maccabees*, but does not receive them a- "mong the canonical ſcriptures: and that "they, and the books of *Wiſdom* and *Eccle-* "*ſiaſticus*, may be read for the edification of "the people, but not as of authority, for "proving any doctrines." And for the Old Teſtament he recommends *(x)* the true *Jewiſh* canon, or *Hebrew verity*. I refer below to

(s) Haec ſunt, quae patres intra canonem concluſerunt, & ex quibus fidei noſtrae aſſertiones conſtare voluerunt. . . . Sciendum tamen eſt, quod alii libri ſunt, qui non ſunt canonici, ſed eccleſiaſtici a majoribus appellati ſunt. . . Quae omnia legi quidem in eccleſiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Ceteras vero ſcripturas apocryphas nominarunt, quas in eccleſiis legi noluerunt. *Ruſin. citat. ubi ſupra p.* 185. *not. (g).*

(t) Vol. x. p. 41. *(u) . . . p.* 43. *(x) . . .* 52.

(y) to another place relating to the books of the New Teſtament.

The third Council of *Carthage*, about 397. ordains, " that *(z)* nothing beſide the cano- " nical ſcriptures be read in the Church un- " der the name of Divine Scriptures."

Auguſtin, in 395. and afterwards, often *(a)* ſpeaks of *canonical ſcriptures*, and *the (b) whole canon of ſcripture*, that is, all the ſacred books of the Old and New Teſtament. We " *(c)* read of ſome, ſays he, that *they ſearch-* " *ed the ſcriptures daily, whether thoſe things* " *were ſo.* Acts xvii. 11. What ſcriptures, " I pray, except the canonical ſcriptures of " the Law and the Prophets? To them have " been ſince added the Goſpels, the Epiſtles " of Apoſtles, the Acts of the Apoſtles, and " the Revelation of *John*." Of the ſuperior authority of the canonical ſcriptures to all others, he ſpeaks frequently in paſſages afterwards alleged *(d)* in the ſame chapter.

Chryſoſtom in a place already cited *(e)* ſays: " They

(y) Vol. x. p. 86. *(z) . . . p.* 193.

(a) The ſame p. 207.

(b) Totus autem canon ſcripturarum . . his libris continetur. *Ib. not. (r) p.* 208.

(c) . . . p. 252. *(d) See p.* 253. 256. 259. . . 268.

(e) Vol. xii. p. 126.

" They *(f)* fall into great abſurdities, who " will not follow the rule (or canon) of the " divine ſcripture, but truſt entirely to their " own reaſoning." I refer to another place *(g)* to the like purpoſe.

Says *Iſidore* of *Peluſium*, about 412. " that " *(i)* theſe things are ſo, we ſhall perceive, " if we attend to the rule [canon] of truth, " the divine ſcriptures."

And *Leontius*, of *Conſtantinople*, about 610. having cited the whole catalogue of the books of ſcripture from Geneſis to the Revelation *(k)* concludes: " Theſe *(l)* are the " ancient and the new books, which are re- " ceived in the Church as canonical."

By all which we diſcern, how much the uſe of theſe words, *canon* and *canonical*, has obtained among Chriſtians, denoting thoſe books, which are of the higheſt authority, and the rule of faith: as oppoſed to all other what-

(f) Ὁρᾶς, εἰς ὅσην ἀτοπίαν ἐκπίπτουσιν οἱ μὴ βουλόμενοι τῷ τῆς θείας γραφῆς κατακολουθεῖν κανόνι κ. λ. *In Gen. cap.* 33. *hom.* 58. *T.* 4. *p.* 566. *B.*

(g) Vid. hom. 33. *in Act. Ap. ſub fin.*

(i) Ὅτι δὲ ταῦτα ὕτως ἔχει, τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας, τὰς θείας φημὶ γραφὰς, καταπτεύσωμεν. *Iſid. ep.* 114. *l.* 4.

(k) See Vol. xi. p. 381.

(l) Ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ κανονιζόμενα βιβλία ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τά παλαιὰ καὶ νέα. *Citat. ibid. p.* 380. *not. (e).*

whatever, particularly, to eccleſiaſtical, or the writings of orthodox and learned catholics, and to *apocryphal*, the productions, chiefly, of heretics, which by a ſpecious name and title made a pretenſion to be accounted among ſacred books.

Old and New Teſtament.

IV. The moſt common and general diviſion of the canonical books is that of *ancient and new*, or *the Old and New Teſtament*. The Hebrew word, *berith*, from which it is tranſlated, properly ſignifies *(m)* covenant. St. *Paul* 2 Cor. iii. 6. . . . . 18. ſhewing the ſuperior excellence of the goſpel-covenant, or the diſpenſation by *Chriſt*, above the legal covenant, or the diſpenſation by Moſes, uſeth the word *teſtament*, not only for the covenant itſelf, but likewiſe for the books, in which it is contained. At leſt he does ſo, in ſpeaking of the legal covenant. For, repreſenting the caſe of the unbelieving part of the Jewiſh People, he ſays v. 14. *Until this day remaineth the ſame vail untaken away in reading the Old Teſtament.*

It is no wonder therefore, that this way of ſpeaking has much prevailed among Chriſtians.

(m) Notandum, quod *Brith*, verbum Hebraicum, Aquila συνθήκην, id eſt, *pactum*, interpretatur: LXX ſemper διαθήκην, id eſt, *teſtamentum*: et in pleriſque ſcripturarum locis teſtamentum non voluntatem defunctorum ſonare, ſed pactum viventium. *Hieron. in Malach. cap. ii. T. 3. p.* 1816.

ans. *Melito*, Biſhop of *Sardis* about the year 177. went into the Eaſt, to get an exact account of the books of the Law and the Prophets. In his letter to his friend *Oneſimus*, giving an account of his journey, and reckoning up the books in their order, he calls them *(n) the ancient books*, and *(o) the books of the Old Teſtament*. *Euſebe* calls it *(p)* " a cata-" logue of the acknowledged ſcriptures of the " Old Teſtament." Our Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian elſewhere *(q)* ſpeaks of the ſcriptures of the New Teſtameut. I ſhall remind my readers of but one inſtance more. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, introducing his catalogue of ſcriptures received by the Chriſtian Church, ſays: " Theſe *(r)* things we are taught by the di-" vinely inſpired ſcriptures of the Old and " New Teſtament." Many other like examples occur in the preceding volumes of this work.

Inſtrument. V. Inſtead of *teſtament* Latin writers ſometimes uſe the word *inſtrument*, denoting writing,

(n) Ἔτι δὲ καὶ μαθεῖν τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν βιβλίων ἐβουλήθης ἀκρίβειαν. κ. λ. *Ap. Euſeb. l.* 4. *c.* 27. *p.* 148. *D.*

(o) . . Καὶ ἀκριβῶς μαθὼν τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία. *Ib. p.* 149. *A.*

(p) *Ibid. p.* 148. *D.* (q) *See Vol. viii. p.* 197.

(r) *The ſame. p.* 267.

ting, charter, record. We find it ſeveral times in *Tertullian*, reckoned the moſt ancient Latin writer of the Church now remaining. In a paſſage already *(s)* cited he calls the Goſpels, or the New Teſtament in general, the Evangelic Inſtrument. And ſays: "How *(t)* large chaſms *Marcion* has made in the epiſtle to the *Romans*, by leaving out what he pleaſes, may appear from our entire Inſtrument:" or our unaltered copies of the New Teſtament, particularly of that epiſtle. Speaking of the Shepherd of *Hermas*, he ſays, it *(u)* was not reckoned a part of the Divine Inſtrument: thereby meaning, as it ſeems, the New Teſtament. Which paſſage was quoted by us *(x)* formerly. He calls *(y)* the Law and the Prophets the Jewiſh Inſtruments: that is, writings, or ſcriptures. He ſpeaks of

(s) See Vol. ii. p. 577.

(t) Quantas autem foveas in iſta vel maxime epiſtola [ad Romanos] Marcion fecerit, auferendo quae voluit, de noſtri Inſtrumenti integritate patebit. *Adv. Marcion. l.* 5. *cap.* 13. *p.* 601.

(u) Sed cederem tibi, ſi ſcriptura Paſtoris — divino inſtrumento meruiſſet incidi. . . *De Pudicit. cap.* 10. *p.* 727. *A.*

(x) See Vol. ii. p. 638.

(y) Aut nunquid non juſti Judaei, & quibus poenitentia non opus eſſet, habentes gubernacula diſciplinae, & timoris inſtrumenta, Legem & Prophetas. *De Pudicitia. cap* 7. *p.* 722. *B.*

of the antiquity *(z)* of the Jewiſh Inſtruments, or Scriptures. He *(a)* ſeems in one place to uſe the word *inſtrument*, as equivalent to ſcriptures, containing the doctrine of revelation, or the revealed will of God.

Digeſt. VI. *Digeſt* is another word uſed by *Tertullian* in ſpeaking of the ſcriptures. "*Luke*'s *(b)* Digeſt, he ſays, is often aſcribed to *Paul*." He calls *(c)* the Goſpels, or the whole New Teſtament, *our Digeſt*, in alluſion, as it ſeems, to ſome collection of the Roman Laws digeſted into order. Thoſe two paſſages were cited in the chapter of *Tertullian*. I now tranſcribe the later below *(d)* more at large, it having alſo the word

(z) Primam inſtrumentis iſtis auctoritatem ſumma antiquitas vindicat. *Apol. cap.* 19. *p.* 19. *B.*

Sed quoniam edidimus, antiquiſſimis Judaeorum inſtrumentis ſectam iſtam eſſe ſuffultam. *Apol. cap.* 21. *in. p.* 20.

(a) Sed quo plenius et impreſſius tam ipſum, quam diſpoſitiones ejus et voluntates adiremus, inſtrumentum adjecit literaturae, ſi quis velit de Deo inquirere. *Apol. cap.* 18. *p.* 18. *C.*

(b) See Vol. ii. p. 581. *or* 579.

(c) The ſame. p. 629. *or* 630.

(d) Si vero Apoſtoli quidam integrum evangelium contulerunt, de ſola convictus inaequalitate reprehenſi, Pſeudapoſtoli autem veritatem eorum interpolârunt, et inde ſunt noſtra digeſta: quod erit germanum illud Apoſtolorum inſtrumentum, quod adulteros paſſum eſt? *Adver. Marc. l.* 4. *cap.* 3. *p.* 504. *B.*

word inſtrument, as equivalent to the New Teſtament. He likewiſe calls the Jewiſh Scriptures *(e) Sacred Digeſts.* He ſeems to uſe the word digeſt *(f)* elſewhere, as equivalent to writing, or work, in general.

I ſhall not take notice of any other general denominations of the ſacred ſcriptures.

VII. My chief concern is with the New Teſtament, which, as is well known, conſiſts of Goſpels, the Acts, and Epiſtles. The only word, that needs explanation is the firſt. *Goſpel.*

Goſpel is a tranſlation of the Greek word εὐαγγέλιον, the Latin word, *evangelium*, which ſignifies any good meſſage or tidings. In the New Teſtament the word denotes the doctrine of ſalvation, taught by Jeſus Chriſt, and his Apoſtles. Which indeed is goſpel by way of eminence, as it is the beſt tidings that ever were publiſhed in this world. Says *Theodoret* upon Rom. i. 1. "He *(g)* "calls

(e) Sed homines gloriae, ut diximus, et eloquentiae ſolius libidinoſi, ſi quid in ſanctis offenderunt digeſtis, exinde regeſtum pro inſtituto curioſitatis ad propria verterunt, *Apol. cap.* 47. *p.* 41. *B.*

(f) Elegi ad compendium Varronis opera, qui rerum divinarum ex omnibus retro digeſtis commentatus, idoneum ſe nobis ſcopum expoſuit. *Ad Nation. l.* 2. *cap. i. p.* 64. *C.*

(g) Εὐαγγέλιον δὲ τὸ κήρυγμα προσηγόρευσεν, ὡς πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑπισχνούμενον χορηγίαν. Εὐαγγελίζεται γὰρ τὰς τῆ

" calls it *goſpel*, as it contains aſſurance of " many good things. For it proclaims peace " with God, the overthrow of Satan, the " remiſſion of ſins, the aboliſhing of death, " the reſurrection of the dead, eternal life, " and the kingdom of heaven."

Says St. *Matthew* iv. 23. *And Jeſus went about all Galilee, teaching in their ſynagogues, and preaching the goſpel of the kingdom.* Καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ ἐυαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας· Mark xiii. 10. *And the goſpel* [τὸ ἐυαγγέλιον] *muſt firſt be preached to all nations.* Ch. xvi. 15. *Go ye into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature.* Κηρύξατε τὸ ἐυαγγέλιον. It is called *the word of truth, the goſpel of our ſalvation.* Eph. i. 13. And in like manner, in other places.

But by *goſpel*, when uſed by us concerning the writings of the Evangeliſts, we mean the *hiſtorie of Chriſt's preaching, and miracles.* The word ſeems alſo to be ſo uſed by St. Mark i. 1. *The begining of the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt.* Which may be underſtood, and para-

θεὲ καταλλαγὰς, τὴν τὲ διαβόλε κατάλυσιν, τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τὴν ἄφεσιν, τὲ θανάτε τὴν παῦλαν, τῶν νεκρῶν τὴν ἀνάστασιν, τὴν ζωὴν τὴν ἀιώνιον, τὴν βασιλέιαν τῶν ὐρανῶν. *In ep. ad Rom. T. 3. p. 10. B.*

paraphraſed thus: "Here (A) begins the "Hiſtorie of the life and doctrine of Jeſus "Chriſt, the Son of God, and Saviour of "mankind."

St. *Luke*, referring to the book of his Goſpel, ſays: Acts i. 1. 2. *The former treatiſe have I made, o Theophilus, of all that Jeſus began to do and teach, until the day in the which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghoſt had given commandments unto the Apoſtles, whom he had choſen.* But St. *Luke*, as it ſeems, there puts the principal part for the whole. For he has therein writ alſo the hiſtorie of our Lord's miraculous birth, and divers extraordinarie events attending it: and likewiſe the hiſtorie of the birth of *John* the Baptiſt, and divers circumſtances of it, and his preaching and death.

In this ſenſe the word Goſpel is frequently underſtood by us. A Goſpel is the hiſto-

(A) *That is Dr. Clarke's Paraphraſe.* But I am ſenſible, it will not be allowed by all. *Oecumenius* ſays, that by goſpel *Mark* does not intend his own writing, but Chriſt's preaching. Μάρκος, ἀρχὴ, φησὶ, τοῦ εὐαγγέλιου ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ἀλλὰ οὐ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ συγγραφὴν καλεῖ εὐαγγέλιον, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ κήρυγμα. *Oecum. in Act. Ap.* He proceeds to ſay, that the faithful afterwards called the writings of the Evangeliſts *Goſpels*, as truly containing the goſpel, that is, the doctrine of Chriſt. *See Vol. xi. p.* 413.

rie of Jeſus Chriſt, his doctrine, miracles, reſurrection, and aſcenſion: not excluding the hiſtorie of his fore-runner, who (B) alſo is ſaid to have *preached the goſpel*, that is, the doctrine of the goſpel, or the kingdom of God.

The Goſpel according to *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, *John*, is the hiſtorie of Jeſus Chriſt, as writ by thoſe ſeveral Evangeliſts.

(B) Matt. iii. 1. 2. *In thoſe days came John the Baptiſt, preaching in the wilderneſſe of Judea, and ſaying: Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.* Compare Mark i. 4. Luke iii. 1. 2. And ſays St. Luke iii. 18. *And many other things in his exhortation preached he unto the people.* Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερα παρακαλῶν, εὐηγγελίζετο τὸν λαόν. Which may be litterally rendred thus: *And exhorting many other like things, he evangelized* [or *preached the goſpel to*] *the people.*

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

General Obſervations upon the Canon of the New Teſtament.

I. THE canonical books of the New Teſtament, received by Chriſtians in this part of the world, are the Four Goſpels, the Acts of the Apoſtles, Fourteen Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, Seven Catholic Epiſtles, and the Revelation.

II. There may be different canons of the New Teſtament among Chriſtians.

Indeed, there have been in former times, and ſtill are, different ſentiments among Chriſtians, concerning the number of books to be received as canonical. The *(a)* canon of the *Syrian* churches is not the ſame as ours. *Jerome* tells us, that *(b)* in his time ſome of the Latins rejected the epiſtle to the

(a) See Vol. ix. p. 221. Vol. xi. p. 270. . . 275.
(b) Vol. x. p. 122, 123.

Hebrews, and ſome of the Greeks the book of the Revelation. From *Chryſoſtom*'s works we perceive, that *(c)* he did not receive the ſecond epiſtle of St. *Peter*, nor the ſecond and third of St. *John*, nor the epiſtle of St. *Jude*, nor the Revelation. And there is reaſon to think, that *(d) Theodoret*'s canon likewiſe was much the ſame with *Chryſoſtom*'s, and that of the churches in *Syria*. Nevertheleſs, we have obſerved in the courſe of this work, that about the ſame time the *Egyptians*, and the Chriſtians in divers other parts of the world, had the ſame number of canonical books, that we have.

But to come nearer our own time. *Calvin (e) Grotius (f) Le Clerc (g) Philip Limborch (h)* and ſome other learned moderns, have not admitted the epiſtle to the *He-*

(c) The ſame. p. 341. *(d) Vol. xi. p.* 88. 89. 91.

(e) Ego ut Paulum agnoſcam auctorem, adduci nequeo. *Calvin. argum. in ep. ad Hebr.*

(f) Facillima refutatu eſt poſtrema haec opinio, ideo quod Paulinae epiſtolae inter ſe ſint germanae, pari charactere ac dicendi modo : haec vero manifeſte ab iis diſcrepet, ſelectiores habens voces Graecas, leniuſque fluens, non autem fracta brevibus inciſis, ac ſalebroſa. . . . . *Grot. Prooem. in ep. ad Hebr.*

(g) Hiſt. Ec. Ann. 69. *p.* 455. . . 461.

(h) Prolegom. in ep. ad Hebr.

Hebrews to have been writ by St. *Paul:* though *(i)* they were willing to allow it to be the work of an apoſtolical man, and a valuable part of ſacred ſcripture. But I cannot ſay, that they were in the right in ſo doing. For it appears to me to have been a maxim of the ancient Chriſtians, not to receive any doctrinal or preceptive writing, as of authority, unleſs it were known to be the work of an Apoſtle. Conſequently, the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, if writ by an apoſtolical man only, ſhould not be eſteemed canonical.

Grotius (k) likewiſe ſuppoſed the ſecond

(i) Hiſce argumentis utrinque attente expenſis dicendum videtur, Paulum epiſtolae hujus ſcriptorem non videri . . . . . Quis vero illius ſcriptor ſit, incertum eſt. Alii eam Lucae, alii Barnabae, alii Clementi adſcribunt. . . Interim divinam hujus epiſtolae autoritatem agnoſcimus, multiſque aliis, quas ab Apoſtolis eſſe ſcriptas, conſtat, ob argumenti quod tractat praeſtantiam praeferendam judicamus. *Limb. ibid. Vid. et Calvin. ubi ſupra.*

(k) Jam olim veterum multi credidêre, non eſſe apoſtoli Petri, argumento tum dictionis ab epiſtola priore multum diverſae, quod agnoſcunt Euſebius & Hieronymus, tum quod multae olim eccleſiae hanc non receperint. . Scriptorem autem hujus epiſtolae arbitror eſſe Simeonem ſive Simonem, epiſcopum poſt Jacobi mortem Hieroſolymis, ejuſdemque Jacobi, cujus epiſtolam habemus, ſucceſſorem & imitatorem. . . . . Unde etiam conſtat, vixiſſe hunc poſt excidium Hieroſolymitanum ad Trajani tempore, & tunc pro nomine Chriſti crucifixum. *Annot. in Ep. Petri ſecund.*

epiſtle aſcribed to *Peter*, not to have been writ by the Apoſtle *Simon Peter*, but by *Simeon*, choſen Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* after the death of *James* the Juſt, whoſe epiſtle we have. Which *Simeon* lived to the time of *Trajan*, when he was crucified for the name of Chriſt. Upon which I only obſerve at preſent, that if this *Simeon* be the writer of this epiſtle, it ſhould not be a part of canonical ſcripture.

The ſame learned man ſuppoſeth *(l)* the ſecond and third epiſtles, called St. *John*'s, not to have been writ by *John* the Apoſtle, but by another *John*, an Elder or Preſbyter, who lived about the ſame time, and after him, at *Epheſus*.

And the epiſtle called St. *Jude*'s, he thought *(m)* to have been written by one of that

(l) Hanc epiſtolam, & eam quae ſequitur, non eſſe Johannis Apoſtoli, veterum multi jam olim crediderunt, a quibus non diſſentiunt Euſebius & Hieronymus. Et magna ſunt in id argumenta. Nam duos fuiſſe Johannes Epheſi, Apoſtolum, ac Preſbyterum, ejus diſcipulum, ſemper conſtitit ex ſepulchris, alio hujus, alio illius : quae ſepulchra vidit Hieronymus. *Grot. Annot. in ep. Joan. ſecund.*

(m) Quare omnino adducor, ut credam eſſe hanc epiſtolam Judae Epiſcopi Hieroſolymitani, qui fuit Adriani temporibus, paullo ante Barchochebam. *Id. in Annot. ad ep. Judae.*

that name, who was Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* in the time of the Emperour *Adrian*, and not till after there had been ſeveral other Biſhops of that church, ſince the death of the forementioned *Simeon*. If ſo, I believe, all men may be of opinion, that this epiſtle ought not to be placed in the canon of the New Teſtament.

It may not be thought right, if I ſhould here entirely omit Mr. *Whiſton*, whoſe canon conſiſted of the *(n)* Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, and divers other books, as ſacred, beſide thoſe generally received: and *(o)* the Conſtitutions

(n) "The ſacred books of the New Teſtament ſtill extant, both thoſe in the 85. canon, and thoſe written afterwards, are the ſame, which we now receive: together with the eight books of Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, and their epitome, the Doctrine of the Apoſtles: the two epiſtles of *Clement*, the epiſtle of *Barnabas*, the Shepherd of *Hermas*: and perhaps the ſecond book of apocryphal *Eſdras*, with the epiſtles of *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*." *Eſſay on the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. ch. i. p.* 70. 71.

(o) "If any one has a mind to ſort the ſeveral books of the New Teſtament, he may in the firſt place ſet the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, with it's extract, or Doctrine of the Apoſtles, as derived from the body, or College of the Apoſtles, met in Councils. In the next place he may put the four Goſpels, with their appendix, the Acts of the Apoſtles. The Apocalypſe of *John* alſo cannot be reckoned at all inferior to them, though it be quite of another nature from them. In the third rank may ſtand the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, *Paul*, *Peter* and *John*. In the fourth rank may ſtand the Epiſtles of the brethren

tutions, in particular, as the moſt ſacred of all the canonical books of the New Teſtament.

Concerning which I beg leave to obſerve, *firſt*, that the receiving the Conſtitutions as a ſacred book, and part of the rule of faith, would make a great alteration in the Chriſtian ſcheme. Some might be induced to think it no great bleſſing to mankind, and ſcarcely deſerving an apologie. *Secondly*, Mr. *Whiſton*'s canon is not the canon of the Chriſtian churches in former times: as is manifeſt from the large collections, made by us in the preceding volumes, from eccleſiaſtical writers of every age, to the begining of the twelfth centurie. *Thirdly*, Mr. *Whiſton*, notwithſtanding all his labours, made few converts to this opinion. Which I impute to the knowledge and learning of our times. And as the Chriſtian Religion is built upon facts, the ſtudie of Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity will

brethren of our Lord, *James* and *Jude*. In the fifth and laſt rank may ſtand the epiſtles and writings of the companions and attendants of the Apoſtles, *Barnabas*, *Clement*, *Hermas*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*. All which, with the addition perhaps of apocryphal *Eſdras*, and of the *Apocalypſe of Peter*, and the *Acts of Paul*, were they now exſtant, I look upon, though in different degrees, as the ſacred books of the New Teſtament." *Ibid. p.* 72. 73.

will be always needful, and may be of uſe, to defeat various attempts of ingenious, but miſtaken and prejudiced men.

III. A ſhort canon of Scripture is moſt eligible.

Religion is the concern of all men. A few ſhort hiſtories and epiſtles are better fitted for general uſe, than numerous and prolix writings. Beſides, if any writings are to be received as the rule of faith and manners, it is of the utmoſt importance, that they be juſtly entitled to that diſtinction. Otherwiſe men may be led into errours of very bad conſequence. If any books pretend to deliver the doctrine of infallible, and divinely inſpired teachers, ſuch as Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles are eſteemed by Chriſtians: great care ſhould be taken to be well ſatisfied, that their accounts are authentic, and that they are the genuine writings of the men, whoſe names they bear. The pretenſions of writings, placed in high authority, to which great credit is given, ought to be well atteſted.

Dr. *Jortin*, ſpeaking of the work, called Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, ſays: "The *(p)* au-

(p) Dr. Jortin's Remarks on Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. Vol. i. p. 229.

" authors of them are, it is pretended, the " twelve Apoſtles and St. *Paul* gathered to- " gether, with *Clement* their amanuenſis.

" If their authority ſhould appear only " ambiguous, it would be our duty to reject " them, leſt we ſhould adopt as divine doc- " rines the commandments of men. For " ſince each Goſpel contains the main " parts of Chriſtianity, and might be ſuffi- " cient to make men wiſe to ſalvation; there " is leſs danger in diminiſhing, than in en- " larging the number of canonical books: " and leſs evil would have enſued from the " loſs of one of the four Goſpels, than from " the addition of a fifth and ſpurious one."

In my opinion, that is a very fine and valuable obſervation.

And I ſhall tranſcribe again an obſervation of *Auguſtin*, formerly *(q)* taken notice of. " Our canonical books of ſcripture, which " are of the higheſt Authority with us, have " been ſettled with great care. They ought " to be few, leaſt their value ſhould be di- " miniſhed. And yet they are ſo many, that " their agreement throughout is wonder- " ful."

IV. I

(q) See Vol. x. p. 289.

IV. I have been ſometimes apt to think, that the beſt canon of the New Teſtament would be that, which may be collected from *(r) Euſebe* of *Caeſarea*, and ſeems to have been the canon of ſome in his time.

The canon ſhould conſiſt of two claſſes. In the firſt ſhould be thoſe books, which he aſſures us were then *univerſally acknowledged*, and had been all along received by all catholic Chriſtians. Theſe are the four Goſpels, the Acts of the Apoſtles, thirteen epiſtles of St. *Paul*, one epiſtle of St. *Peter*, and one epiſtle of St. *John*. Theſe only ſhould be of the higheſt authority, from which doctrines of religion may be proved.

In the other claſſe ſhonld be placed thoſe books, of which *Euſebe* ſpeaks, as contradicted in his time, though well known: concerning which there were doubts, whether they were writ by the perſons, whoſe names they bear, or whether the writers were Apoſtles of Chriſt. Theſe are the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, the epiſtle of *James*, the ſecond of *Peter*, the ſecond and third of *John*, the epiſtle of *Jude*, and the Revelation. Theſe ſhould be reckoned doubtful, and contradicted: though many might be of opinion, that

(r) *Vol. viii. p.* 90. . . 105.

that there is a good deal of reaſon to believe them genuine. And they ſhould be allowed to be publicly read in Chriſtian aſſemblies, for the edification of the people: but not be alleged, as affording, alone, ſufficient proof of any doctrine.

That I may not be miſunderſtood, I muſt add, that there ſhould be no third claſſe of ſacred books: foraſmuch as there appears not any reaſon from Chriſtian antiquity to allow of that character and denomination to any Chriſtian writings, beſide thoſe above-mentioned.

In this canon the preceding rule is regarded. It is a ſhort canon. And it ſeems to have been thought of by ſome (A) about the time of the Reformation.

V. Ne-

(A) We learn from *Paul Sarpi*'s Hiſtorie of the Council of *Trent*, that one of the doctrinal articles concerning ſacred ſcripture, extracted, or pretended to be extracted out of *Luther*'s works, was this: "that no books ſhould be reckoned "a part of the Old Teſtament, beſide thoſe received by the "Jews: and that out of the New Teſtament ſhould be "excluded the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, the epiſtle of *James*, "the ſecond of *Peter*, the ſecond and third of *John*, the "epiſtle of *Jude*, and the Revelation." And there were ſome Biſhops in that Council, "who would have had the books "of the New Teſtament divided into two claſſes: in one of "which ſhould be put thoſe books only, which had been al-

"ways

V. Nevertheleſs that, which is now generally received, is a good canon.

For it contains only thoſe books, which were acknowledged by all in the time of *Euſebe*, and from the begining, and ſeven other, which were then well known, and were next in eſteem to thoſe before mentioned, as univerſally acknowledged: and were more generally received as of authority, than any other controverted writings. Nor is there in them any thing inconſiſtent with the facts, or principles, delivered in the univerſally acknowledged books. And moreover, there may be a great deal of reaſon to think, that they are the genuine writings of thoſe, to whom they are aſcribed, and that the writers were apoſtles. This evidence will be carefully examined, and diſtinctly conſidered, as we proceed.

In this canon likewiſe the above-mentioned rule is regarded. It is a ſhort canon. For out of it are excluded many books, which might

"ways received without contradiction: and in the other "thoſe, which had been rejected by ſome, or about which "at leſt there had been doubts." And Dr. *Courayer*, in his notes, ſeems to favor this propoſal. *See his French tranſlation of the Hiſtorie of the Council of Trent. Liv. 2, ch. 43. Tom. i. p. 235. and ch. 47. p. 240. and note i.*

might ſeem to make a claim to be ranked among ſacred and canonical ſcriptures.

VI. There are not any books, beſide thoſe now generally received by us, that ought to be eſteemed canonical, or books of authority.

I ſuppoſe this to be evident to all, who have carefully attended to the hiſtorie in the ſeveral volumes of this work: and that there is no reaſon to receive, as a part of ſacred ſcripture, the epiſtle of *Barnabas*, *the epiſtle of Clement*, *the Shepherd of Hermas*, *the Recognitions*, *the Clementin Homilies*, *the Doctrine of the Apoſtles*, *the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, *the Goſpel of Peter*, *or Matthias*, *or Thomas*, *the Preaching of Peter*, *the Acts of Peter and Paul*, *of Andrew and John and other Apoſtles*, *the Revelation of Peter*, *and Paul*, *their Travels or Circuits*. That theſe books were not received, as ſacred ſcripture, or a part of the rule of faith, by Chriſtians in former times, has been ſhewn. Nor can they therefore be reaſonably received by us as ſuch.

The only writing of all theſe, that ſeems to make a fair claim to be a part of ſacred ſcripture, is the epiſtle of St. *Barnabas*, if genuine,

genuine, as I *(s)* have ſuppoſed it to be. Nevertheleſs, I think, it ought not to be received as ſacred ſcripture, or admitted into the canon, for theſe reaſons.

1. It was not reckoned a book of authority, or a part of the rule of faith, by thoſe ancient chriſtians, who have quoted it, and taken the greateſt notice of it.

Clement of *Alexandria* has *(t)* quoted this epiſtle ſeveral times, but not as deciſive, and by way of full proof, as we ſhewed. Nor is it ſo quoted by *(u) Origen*. Nor is the epiſtle of *Barnabas* in any of *(x) Origen*'s catalogues of the books of Scripture, which we ſtill find in his works, or are taken notice of by *Euſebe*. By that Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian, in one place it is reckoned *(y)* among *ſpurious* writings, that is, ſuch as were generally rejected and ſuppoſed not to be a part of the New Teſtament. At other times it is called by him *(z) a contradicted* book, that is, not received by all.

Nor is this epiſtle placed among ſacred

(s) See Ch. i. Vol. i. p. 23. . . . 30.
(t) See Vol. ii. p. 521. . . . 523.
(u) See Vol. iii. p. 305. 306.
(x) The ſame p. 234. . . . 243.
(y) Vol. viii. p. 97. 167. *(z) P.* 96. 97.

ſcriptures by following writers, who have given catalogues of the books of the New Teſtament. It is wanting, particularly, in the Feſtal Epiſtle *(a)* of *Athanaſius*, in *(b)* the catalogue of *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, of *(c)* the Council of *Laodicea*, of *(d) Epiphanius*, *(e) Gregorie Nazianzen*, *(f) Amphilochius*, and *(g) Jerome*, *(h) Rufin*, *(i)* the Council of *Carthage*, and *(k) Auguſtin*. Nor has it been reckoned a part of canonical ſcripture by later writers.

2. *Barnabas* was not an Apoſtle.

For he was not one of the twelve Apoſtles of Chriſt. Nor was he choſen in the room of *Judas*. Nor is there in the Acts any account of his being choſen into the number of Apoſtles, or appointed to be an Apoſtle by Chriſt, as *Paul* was. What St. *Luke* ſays of *Barnabas* is, *that he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghoſt, and of faith.* Acts xi. 24. And in ch. xiii. 1. he is mentioned among *Prophets and Teachers* in the church of *Antioch*. But St. *Luke* ſpeaks in the like manner of *Stephen*, of whom he ſays, he

(a) Vol. viii. p. 227. . . . 229.
(b) P. 269. 270.
(c) P. 291. . . 293.
(d) P. 303. 304.
(e) Vol. ix. p. 133.
(f) P. 147. 148.
(g) Vol. x. p. 76. 77.
(h) P. 177. 178.
(i) P. 193. 194.
(k) P. 210. 211.

he was *a man full of faith, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* vi. 5. *full of faith and power.* v. 8. *full of the Holy Ghoſt.* vii. 55. And all the ſeven were *full of the Holy Ghoſt, and wiſdom.* vi. 3.

That *Barnabas* was not an Apoſtle, I think, may be concluded from Gal. ii. 9. where *Paul* ſays: *And when James, and Cephas, and John, who ſeemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given to me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of Fellowſhip.* By *grace* I ſuppoſe St. *Paul* to mean the favour of the apoſtleſhip. So Rom. i. 5. *By whom we have received grace and apoſtleſhip*, that is, the favour of the apoſtleſhip. Ch. xii. 3. *For I ſay, through the grace given to me*, meaning the eſpecial favour of the apoſtleſhip. And ſee ch. xv. 15. 1 Cor. xv. 10. Eph. iv. 7. compared with ver. 11.

If *Barnabas* had been an Apoſtle, in the fulleſt ſenſe of the word, St. *Paul* would not have ſaid in the above cited place from the ſecond to the *Galatians, when they perceived the grace given to me*, but, *when they perceived the grace given to me, and Barnabas.* And in the preceding part of the context, particularly, in ver. 7. 8. he twice

ſays *me*, where he would have ſaid *us*, if *Barnabas* had been an Apoſtle. For he had been mentioned before, in ver. 1.

Indeed, in the Acts, where *Paul* and *Barnabas* are mentioned together, *Barnabas* is ſometimes firſt named, as Acts xi. 30. xii. 25. xiii. 1. 2. and 7. xiv. 14. xv. 12. 25. Which, I think, not at all ſtrange, among perſons, who were not intent upon precedence: when too *Barnabas* was the elder in years and diſcipleſhip. But in ſeveral other places *Paul* is firſt named, as in Acts xiii. 43. 46. xv. 2. 22. 35. of which no other reaſon can be well aſſigned, beſide that of *Paul*'s apoſtleſhip.

Moreover, wherever they travelled together, if there was an opportunity for diſcourſing, *Paul* ſpake. So at *Paphos*, in the iſland of *Cyprus*. Acts xiii. 6. . . 12. And at *Antioch* in *Piſidia*. ch. xiii. 15. 16. See alſo ch. xiv. 12.

And that *Paul* was the principal perſon, appears from that early account, after they had been in *Cyprus*. ch. xiii. 13. *Now when Paul and his companie looſed from Paphos, they came to Perga, in Pamphylia.*

However, there are ſome texts, which muſt be conſidered by us, as ſeeming to afford objections.

Acts

Acts xiv. 4. *But the multitude of the city was divided. Part held with the Jews, and part with the Apoſtles:* that is, *Paul* and *Barnabas*, who were then at *Iconium*. And afterwards, at *Lyſtra*. ver. 14. *Which when the Apoſtles, Barnabas and Paul, heard, ...* Here *Barnabas* is ſtiled an *Apoſtle*, as well as *Paul*.

To which I anſwer, *firſt*. Both being now together, and meeting with the like treatment, might be called *Apoſtles:* though only one of them was, properly, ſo. *Secondly*, it is not unlikely, that *Barnabas* and *Paul* are here ſtiled by St. *Luke Apoſtles*, in regard to what had been done at *Antioch*, as related by him. ch. xii. 1...4. when by an expreſs order from heaven, they were ſent forth from the church at *Antioch*, upon a ſpecial commiſſion, in which they were ſtill employed. That deſignation, however ſolemn, did not make either of them Apoſtles of Chriſt in the higheſt ſenſe. It was not the apoſtolical, which is a general commiſſion. But it was a particular commiſſion, as appears from that whole hiſtorie, and from what is ſaid at the concluſion of the journey, which they had taken. Acts xiv. 26. *And thence they ſailed to Antioch, from whence they had*

been recommended to the grace of God, for the work, which they had fulfilled. Nevertheleſs, they are not unfitly called Apoſtles upon account of it. So 2 Cor. viii. 13. *Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner, and fellow-helper concerning you: or our brethren be enquired of, they (l) are the meſſengers of the churches*, literally, apoſtles of the churches, *and the glorie of Chriſt.* If thoſe brethren, which had been appointed by the churches to go to *Jeruſalem*, with the contributions, which had been made for the relief of the poor ſaints in *Judea*, might be called Apoſtles; there can be no doubt, but *Paul* and *Barnabas* might be called Apoſtles in regard to the work, to which they had been ſolemnly appointed by the church at *Antioch.*

Again 1 Cor. ix. 5. 6. *Have we not power to lead about a ſiſter, a wife, as well as other Apoſtles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? Or I only, and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?*

Some may think, that *Barnabas* is here ſuppoſed to be an Apoſtle. I anſwer, that though *Barnabas* was not an Apoſtle properly,

(l) ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν.

perly, or equally with himſelf, yet *Paul*, out of an affectionate reſpect to his friend, companion, and fellow-laborer, might be diſpoſed to mention him, upon this occaſion, in the manner he has done. This is ſaid, ſuppoſing all before-mentioned to have been Apoſtles of Chriſt, in the higheſt ſenſe. But, *ſecondly*, it is not certain, that all, before-mentioned, were ſtrictly Apoſtles. It ſeems to me more likely, that by *the brethren of the Lord* ſome are intended, who were not Apoſtles. If ſo, *Paul* might reaſonably, and without offenſe, gratify his friendly diſpoſition: and inſert here the name of *Barnabas*, who had ſhared with him many fatigues and difficulties in the ſervice of the goſpel, though he was not an Apoſtle.

I do not therefore diſcern any good reaſon from the New Teſtament, why *Barnabas* ſhould be reckoned an Apoſtle. But quite otherwiſe.

The ſenſe of the primitive Chriſtians is agreeable hereto. Few or none of them have thought *Barnabas* an Apoſtle.

Clement of *Alexandria* has quoted *Barnabas (m)* five or ſix times. Twice he calls

(m) *Vol. ii. p.* 521. . . 523.

him *Apoſtle*. In another place he calls him the *apoſtolic Barnabas, who was one of the ſeventy, and fellow-laborer of Paul.* Theſe are the higheſt characters, which he intended to give to *Barnabas*, and what he means, when he calls him *Apoſtle*, as is fully ſhewn in the place juſt referred to.

By *Tertullian*, as cited by us *(n)* formerly, *Barnabas* is plainly reckoned no more, than *(o)* a companion of Apoſtles.

Euſebe, in a chapter concerning thoſe who were diſciples of Chriſt, ſays: "The "*(p)* names of our Saviour's Apoſtles are "well known from the Goſpels. But there "is no where exſtant a catalogue of the "ſeventy diſciples. However, it is ſaid, that "*Barnabas* was one of them, who is expreſs-"ly mentioned in the Acts, and in *Paul*'s "epiſtle to the *Galatians*." That learned writer therefore did not know, that *Barnabas*

(n) . . . *P.* 606. . . . 608.

(o) Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis Apoſtolorum teſtimonium ſuperducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure diſciplinam Magiſtrorum. Exſtat enim & Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos. *Tertull. de Pudicit. cap.* 20. *p.* 741.

(p) . . . Τῶν δὲ ἑβδομήκοντα μαθητῶν καὶ ὁ λόγος μὲν ἐδηλοῖς ἐδαμοῦ φέρεται. Λέγεται γε μὴν εἷς αὐτῶν Βαρνάβας. κ. λ. *H. E. l.* 1. *cap. xii.*

bas was an Apoſtle. In *(q)* another place of the ſame work, his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie, he quotes a paſſage from the ſeventh book of *Clement*'s Inſtitutions or *Hypotopoſes*, where *Barnabas* is ſtiled one of the ſeventy. In his Commentarie upon *Iſaiah (r) Euſebe* computes fourteen Apoſtles, meaning the twelve, and *Paul*, added to them, and equal to them, and *James* the Lord's brother, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, whom *Euſebe* did not think to be one of the twelve. Nor does he here ſay, that *(s)* he was equal to them, or *Paul*. However, from all theſe places we can be fully aſſured, that our learned Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian did not ſo much as ſuſpect *Barnabas* to have been an Apoſtle, in the higheſt ſenſe of the word.

Jerome, in the article of *Barnabas*, in his book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, ſays, *he (t) was ordained with Paul an Apoſtle of the Gentils*. But authors, who write in haſte, as *Jerome* often did, do not always expreſs themſelves exactly and properly. *Jerome* did not think, that *Barnabas* was equally an Apoſtle

(q) L. 2. cap. i. p. 38. D.
(r) Comm. in Eſ. p. 422.
(s) See Vol. viii. p. 154. 155.
(t) See Vol. x. p. 142. 143.

Apoſtle with *Paul*. This may be concluded from what there follows: *He wrote an epiſtle for the edification of the Church, which is read among the apocryphal ſcriptures.* If *Barnabas* had been an Apoſtle, ſtrictly ſpeaking, *Jerome* would not have ſaid, *he wrote an epiſtle for the edification of the Church.* Which any man might do. Nor would his epiſtle have been reckoned apocryphal, as *Jerome* here, and elſewhere *(u)* calls it. When *Jerome* ſays, that *Barnabas was ordained with Paul an Apoſtle of the Gentils*; it is likely, he refers to the hiſtorie in Acts xiii. 1. . . . . 4. of which I have already ſaid all that is needful.

Theodoret, as formerly quoted, ſays: "The "*(x)* all-wiſe Deity committed the culture "of a barren world to a few men, and thoſe "fiſhermen, and publicans, and one tent-"maker." And to the like purpoſe often. Which ſhews, that he did not reckon *Barnabas* an Apoſtle in the fulleſt meaning of the word. If he had, he muſt have added, *and one Levite.* The ſame obſervation may be applied to *Chryſoſtom*, who *(y)* in his many

(u) See again, as before, Vol. x. p. 143.
(x) Vol. xi. p. 96. *See alſo p.* 97. 99. 103.
(y) See Vol. x. p. 366. . . . 370.

ny paſſages ſhewing the wonderful progreſſe of the goſpel, often mentions the Apoſtles *Peter*, a fiſherman, and *Paul* a tent-maker, but never *Barnabas* a Levite.

If then *Barnabas* was not an Apoſtle, an epiſtle writ by him cannot be received as canonical, or a part of the rule of faith: forasmuch as no men, beſide Apoſtles, have the privilege of writing epiſtles, or other works, preceptive, and doctrinal, that ſhall be received by the churches, in that quality. This has been ſaid ſeveral times in the courſe of this *(z)* work. And I ſtill think it right.

Mark (a) and *Luke*, apoſtolical men, may write hiſtories of our Lord's and his Apoſtles preaching, and doctrine, and miracles, which ſhall be received as ſacred, and of authority. But no epiſtles, or other writings, delivering doctrines and precepts, (except only in the way of hiſtorical narration,) can be of authority, but thoſe writ by Apoſtles.

Says *Jerome* of St. *John*: "He *(b)* was "at once Apoſtle, Evangeliſt, and Prophet: "Apoſ-

(z) See *Apoſtles* in the alphabetical Table of principal Matters.

(a) See Vol. ii. p. 525.

(b) Vol. x. p. 101.

" Apoſtle, in that he wrote letters to the " churches as a maſter : Evangeliſt, as he " wrote a book of the Goſpel, which no o- " ther of the twelve Apoſtles did, except " *Matthew :* Prophet, as he ſaw the Reve- " lation in the iſland *Patmos*, where he was " baniſhed by *Domitian*."

Frederic Spanheim, in his Diſſertation concerning the twelve Apoſtles, readily acknowledgeth this to be one prerogative of Apoſtles : " That *(c)* they may write epiſtles, " which ſhall be received as canonical, and " be of univerſal and perpetual authority in " the Church."

3. *Barnabas* does not take upon himſelf the character of an Apoſtle, or a man of authority.

Near the begining of the epiſtle he ſays : " I *(d)* therefore, not as a teacher, but as one " of you, ſhall lay before you a few things, " that you may be joyful."

And

(c) Decimus nobis character apoſtolicae ὑπεροχῆς eſt poteſtas ſcribendi ad eccleſias plures, vel ad omnes, τοῖς καθόλε πισοῖς, hujuſmodi epiſtolas, quae in canonem referri mererentur, id eſt, quae forent canonicae, univerſalis et perpetuae in Eccleſia auctoritatis. *Diſſ. prima de Apoſtol. Duod. num. xi. Opp. T. 2. p.* 310.

(d) Ego autem non tanquam doctor, ſed unus ex vobis, demonſtrabo pauca, per quae in plurimis laetiores ſitis. *Barn. ep. cap. i.*

And ſomewhat lower: "Again, *(e)* I en-
"treat you, as one of you."

He writes as a man, who had gifts of the Spirit, but not that full meaſure, which was a prerogative of Apoſtles. "He *(f)* who "put the engraffed gift of his doctrine in us, "knows, that no man has received [or learn-"ed] from me a truer word. But I know, "that you are worthie."

I ſhall add a few more very modeſt expreſ-ſions, not ſuitable to an Apoſtle.

"Thus *(g)* as much as in me lies, I have "writ to you with great plainneſſe. And I "hope, that according to my ability, I have "omitted nothing conducive to your ſalva-"tion in the preſent circumſtance."

In the laſt chapter: "I *(h)* beſeech you: "I aſk it as a favour of you, whilſt you are "in this beautiful veſſel of the body, be "wanting in none of theſe things."

And

(e) Adhuc & hoc rogo vos, tamquam unus ex vobis. *Ib. cap.* 4.

(f) Οἶδεν ὁ τὴν ἔμφυτον δωρεὰν τῆς διδαχῆς αὐτοῦ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν εἰδὼς γνησίωτερον ἔμαθεν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ λόγον. Ἀλλὰ δίδα, ὅτι ἄξιοι ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς. *Cap.* 9.

(g) Ἐφ' ὅσον ἦν ἐν δυνατῷ καὶ ἁπλότητι δηλῶσαι ὑμῖν ἐλπίζει με ἡ ψυχὴ τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ με μὴ παραλελοιπέναι μέ τι τῶν ἀνηκόντων ὑμῖν εἰς σωτηρίαν, ἐνεστώτων. *Cap.* 17.

(h) Ἐρωτῶ ὑμᾶς, χάριν αἰτέμενος. κ. λ. *Cap.* 21.

And ſtill nearer the concluſion. "Where-"fore I have endeavoured to write to you, "according to my ability, that you might "rejoice."

Upon the whole, this epiſtle well anſwers the character given of *Barnabas* in the Acts, particularly, ch. xi. 24. *He was full of the Holy Ghoſt.* The writer of this epiſtle had the gift of the Spirit, though not that meaſure, which was peculiar to Apoſtles. *He was full of faith.* The writer of this epiſtle had an earneſt zeal for the truth and ſimplicity of the goſpel. He was alſo *a good man.* In this epiſtle we obſerve the mildneſſe and gentleneſſe, by which *Barnabas* ſeems to have been diſtinguiſhed. But we do not diſcern here the dignity and authority of an Apoſtle.

Conſequently, this epiſtle may afford edification, and may be read with that view. But it ought not to be eſteemed by us, as it was not by the ancients, a part of the rule of faith.

(i) Διὸ μᾶλλον ἐσπέυσασα γράψαι, ἀφ' ὧν ἠδυνήθην, εἰς τὸ εὐφρᾶναι ὑμᾶς. *Ibid.*

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the Method, in which the Canon of the New Teſtament has been formed.

THE canon of the New Teſtament is a collection of books, writ by ſeveral perſons, in ſeveral places, and at different times. It is therefore reaſonable to think, that it was formed gradually. At the riſe of the Chriſtian Religion there were no written ſyſtems or records of it. It was firſt taught and confirmed by Chriſt himſelf in his moſt glorious miniſtrie: and was ſtill farther confirmed by his willing death, and his reſurrection from the dead, and aſcenſion to heaven. Afterwards it was taught by word of mouth, and propagated by the preaching of his Apoſtles and their companions. Nor was it fit, that any books ſhould be writ about it, till there

there were converts to receive and keep them, and deliver them to others.

If St. *Paul*'s two epiſtles to the *Theſſalonians* were the firſt written books of the New Teſtament, and not writ till the year 51. or 52. about twenty years after our Saviour's aſcenſion, they would be for a while the only ſacred books of the new diſpenſation.

As the Chriſtians at *Theſſalonica* had received the doctrine taught by *Paul, not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God.* 1 Theſſ. ii. 13. they would receive his epiſtles, as the written word of God. And himſelf taught them ſo to do, requiring, that they ſhould be ſolemnly *read unto all the holy brethren.* 1 Theſſ. v. 27. He gives a like direction, but more extenſive, at the end of his epiſtle to the *Coloſſians.* iv. 16. requiring them, after they had read it *amongſt themſelves, to cauſe it to be read alſo in the church of the Laodiceans: and that they likewiſe read the epiſtle, that would come to them from Laodicea.*

All the Apoſtle *Paul*'s epiſtles, whether to churches or particular perſons, would be received with the like reſpect by thoſe to whom they were ſent, even as the written word of God,

God, or ſacred ſcriptures. And in like manner the writings of all the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts.

They who firſt received them would, as there were opportunities, convey them to others. They who received them, were fully aſſured of their genuinneſſe by thoſe who delivered them. And before the end of the firſt centurie, yea not very long after the midle of it, it is likely, there were collections made of the four Goſpels, and moſt of the other books of the New Teſtament, which were in the hands of a good number of churches and perſons.

From the quotations of *Irenaeus*, *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *Tertullian*, and other writers of the ſecond centurie, of *Origen* in the third, and of *Euſebius* in the fourth centurie, it appears, that the greateſt part of the books, which are now received by us, and are called canonical, were univerſally acknowledged in their times, and had been ſo acknowledged by the elders and churches of former times. And the reſt, now received by us, though they were then doubted of, or controverted by ſome, were *(a)* well known,

(a) See Euſebius Vol. viii. p. 96. 97.

and approved by many. And *Athanaſius*, who lived not long after *Euſebius*, (having flouriſhed from the year 326. and afterwards) received all the ſame books, which are now received by us, and no other. Which has alſo been the prevailing ſentiment ever ſince.

This canon was not determined by the authority of Councils. But the books, of which it conſiſts, were known to be the genuine writings of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, in the ſame way and manner that we know the works of *Ceſar*, *Cicero*, *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Tacitus*, to be theirs. And the canon has been formed upon the ground of an unanimous, or generally concurring teſtimonie and tradition.

In the courſe of this long work we have had frequent occaſion to obſerve, that the canon of the New Teſtament had not been ſettled by any authority univerſally acknowledged, particularly, not in the time of *(b) Euſebius*, nor of *(c) Auguſtin*, nor of *(d) Caſſiodorius*: but that nevertheleſs there was a general agreement among Chriſtians upon this head.

That

(b) Vol. viii. p. 105. *(c) Vol. x.* 207. . . 211.
(d) Vol. xi. 279.

That the number of books to be received as ſacred and canonical had not been determined by the authority of any Council, or Councils, univerſally acknowledged, is apparent from the different judgements among Chriſtians, in ſeveral parts of the world, concerning divers books, particularly, the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and the Revelation: which were received by ſome, rejected, or doubted of by others. Not now to mention any of the Catholic Epiſtles. There was no catalogue of the books of ſcripture in any canon of the Council of *Nice*. *Auguſtin (e)* giving directions to inquiſitive perſons, how they might determine, what books are canonical, and what not, refers not to the deciſions of any Councils. *Caſſiodorius*, in the ſixth centurie, has *(f)* three catalogues, one called *Jerome*'s, another *Auguſtin*'s, another that of the ancient verſion. But he refers not to the decree of any Council, as deciſive. And it ſeems to me, that in all times Chriſtian people and churches have had a liberty to judge for themſelves, according to evidence. And the evidence of the genuinneſſe of moſt of the books of the New Teſtament has been

(e) Vol. x. p. 207. *(f) Vol. xi. p.* 303. . . 306.

ſo clear and manifeſt, that they have been univerſally received.

The genuinneſſe of theſe books, as before ſaid, is known in the ſame way with others, by teſtimonie or tradition. The firſt teſtimonie is that of thoſe who were contemporarie with the writers of them. Which teſtimonie has been handed down to others.

That in this way the primitive Chriſtians formed their judgement concerning the books propoſed to be received as ſacred ſcriptures, appears from their remaining works. Says *Clement* of *Alexandria*: "This *(g)* we "have not in the four Goſpels, which have "been delivered to us, but in that according "to the *Egyptians*." *Tertullian* may be ſeen largely to this purpoſe. Vol. ii. 576... 581. I paſs on to *Origen*, who ſays: "As "*(h)* I have learned by tradition concerning "the four Goſpels, which alone are received "without diſpute by the whole Church of "God under heaven." So *Euſebe*, in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie, often obſerves, what books of the New Teſtament had been quoted by the ancients, and what not. And having rehearſed a catalogue of books univerſally

(g) *Vol. ii. p.* 496. *and* 529. (h) *Vol. iii. p.* 235.

verſally received, and of others controverted, he ſays: "It *(i)* was needful to put down "theſe alſo: diſtinguiſhing the ſcriptures, "which according to eccleſiaſtical tradition "are true, genuine, and univerſally acknow- "ledged, from thoſe which are controverted, "and yet appear to have been known to "many: that by this means we may know "them from ſuch as have been publiſhed "by heretics, under the names of Apoſtles. "Which books none of the eccleſiaſtical "writers in the ſucceſſion from the times of "the Apoſtles have vouchſafed to mention "in their writings." I may not tranſcribe, but only refer to *(k) Athanaſius* in his Feſtal Epiſtle, to *(l) Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, *(m) Ruſin*, and *(n) Auguſtin*.

However, beſide obſerving the teſtimonie of writers in former times, they criticiſed the books, which were propoſed to them: examining their ſtile and contents, and comparing them with thoſe books, which had been already received as genuine upon the ground of an unanimous teſtimonie, and undoubted tradition. Says honeſt *Serapion*,

(i) Vol. viii. p. 97. 98. *See likewiſe p.* 99. . . . 102.
(k) Vol. viii. p. 225. *(l) P.* 268.
(m) Vol. x. p. 193. *(n) P.* 207. 208.

Biſhop of *Antioch*, in an epiſtle to ſome, who had too much reſpect for a writing, entitled *the Goſpel of Peter*: "We *(o)* bre-"thren, receive *Peter*, and the other Apoſ-"tles, as Chriſt: but as ſkilful men, we re-"ject thoſe writings, which are falſly aſcribed "to them: well knowing, that we have re-"ceived no ſuch." And he adds, that upon peruſing that work, he had found the main part of it agreeable to the right doctrine of our Saviour: but there were ſome other things of a different kind. And *Euſebe* adds in the place tranſcribed above: "The *(p)* "ſtile alſo of theſe books is entirely diffe-"rent from that of the Apoſtles. Moreover "the ſentiments and doctrine of theſe wri-"tings differ from the true orthodox Chriſ-"tianity. All which things plainly ſhew, "that they are the forgeries of heretics."

It has been ſometimes ſaid, that the Council of *Laodicea* firſt ſettled the canon of the New Teſtament. But it may be juſtly ſaid to have been ſettled before. At leſt there had been long before a general agreement among Chriſtians, what books were cano-

(o) Vol. ii. p. 558.
(p) Vol. viii. p. 98.

canonical, and what not: what were the genuine writings of Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, and what not. From the decree of the Council itſelf it appears, that there were writings already known by the title of canonical. That Council does nothing in their laſt canon, but declare, "That *(q)* private "pſalms ought not to be read in the church, "nor any books not canonical, but only "the canonical books of the Old and New "Teſtament." After which follows a catalogue or enumeration of ſuch books. The ſame may be ſaid of the third Council of *Carthage*, whoſe 47. canon is to this purpoſe: "Moreover *(r)* it is ordained, that "nothing beſide the Canonical Scriptures "be read in the church, under the name of "Divine Scriptures."

I ſhall now tranſcribe below a long and fine paſſage of Mr. *Le Clerc*, wherein he ſays: "We *(s)* no where read of a Council of the

 "Apoſtles,

(q) Vol. viii. p. 291. 292. *(r) Vol. x. p.* 193.

(s) Nuſquam quidem legimus, Collegium Apoſtolicum, aut coetum ullum Rectorum Eccleſiarum Chriſtianarum coactum eſſe, qui pro auctoritate definierint hunc numerum Evangeliorum eſſe admittendum, non majorem, nec minorem. Sed nec opus fuit, cum omnibus conſtaret, ex teſtimonio et conſenſu aequalium, quatuor haec Evangelia

corum

" Apoſtles, or of any aſſemblie of the Gover-
" nours of Chriſtian churches, convened, to
" determine by their authority, that ſuch a
" number of Goſpels, neither more nor few-
" er, ſhould be received. Nor was there any
" need of it, ſince it is well known to all
" from the concurring teſtimonie of contem-
" poraries, that theſe four Goſpels are the ge-
" nuine writings of thoſe whoſe names they
" bear: and ſince it is alſo manifeſt, that
" there is in them nothing unworthie of thoſe,
" to whom they are aſcribed, nor any thing
" at all contrarie to the revelation of the Old
" Teſta-

eorum vere fuiſſe, quorum nomina praeferunt: cumque nihil in iis legatur quod ſcriptoribus dignum non ſit, vel revelationi Veteris Teſtamenti, rectaeve rationi, vel minimum adverſetur: aut quod inferius aevum, recentiorumque manus ullo modo reſipiat. Non opus fuit ſynodo Grammaticorum, qui, pro imperio, pronunciarent ea ſcripta, verbi cauſſa, Ciceronis et Virgilii, quae eorum eſſe non dubitamus, re verâ tantorum ingeniorum foetus fuiſſe, et poſteritati ea in re conſulerent. Omnium conſenſus, non quaeſitus, non rogatus, ſed ſponte ſignificatus, prout occaſio tulit, reſque ipſae omnibus, qui poſtea vixere, dubitationem omnem anteverterunt. . . Sic et Evangeliorum auctoritas merito conſtituta eſt, et invaluit, perpetuo conſenſu, ſine ullo Rectorum Eccleſiae decreto.

Idem dixerimus de Epiſtolis Apoſtolicis, quae nullius eccleſiaſtici conventus judicio, ſed conſtanti omnium chriſtianorum teſtimonio, rebuſque ipſis, quas complectuntur, auctoritatem omnem ſuam debent. *Cleric. H. E. ann.* 100. *num. iii. iv. Vid. et ann.* 29. *num. xcii.*

" Teſtament, nor to right reaſon. There " was no need of a ſynod of Grammarians, " to declare magiſterially what are the works " of *Cicero*, or *Virgil*. . . In like manner the " authority of the Goſpels has been eſtabliſh- " ed by general and perpetual conſent, with- " out any decree of the Governours of the " Church. We may ſay the ſame of the " Apoſtolical Epiſtles, which owe all their " authority, not to the deciſions of any eccle- " ſiaſtical aſſemblie, but to the concurring " teſtimonie of all Chriſtians, and the things " themſelves, which are contained in them."

Mr. *James Baſnage (t)* has ſeveral chapters, ſhewing how the canon of the New Teſtament was formed, without the authoritative deciſions of Councils. I likewiſe refer to *(u)* Mr. *Jones* upon this ſubject. I muſt alſo remind my readers of *(x) Auguſtin*'s excellent obſervations, in his arguments with the *Manicheans*, concerning the genuinneſſe and integrity of the books of the New Teſtament. I ſhall tranſcribe from him here a few lines only, which are very much to the preſent purpoſe. " We *(y)* know the wri- " tings

(t) Hiſt. de l' Egliſe. l. 8. *ch. v. vi. vii.*
(u) New and full Method. Part. i. ch. v. vi. vii.
(x) See Vol. vi. p. 375. . . 381. *(y) P.* 379.

" tings of the Apoſtles, ſays he, as we know " the works of *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, *Cicero*, *Varro*, " and others. And as we know the writ- " ings of divers eccleſiaſtical authors: foraſ- " much as they have the teſtimonie of con- " temporaries, and of thoſe who have lived " in ſucceding ages."

Upon the whole, the writings of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts are received, as the works of other eminent men of antiquity are, upon the ground of general conſent and teſtimonie. Nor does the canon of the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament owe it's eſtabliſhment to the deciſions of Councils: but it is the judgement of Chriſtian people in general. And ſo far as we are able to perceive, after a long and careful examination, it is a right and reaſonable judgement. And it may induce us to believe, that if men were encouraged to think freely, in other matters alſo, and to judge for themſelves, according to evidence, and proper aſſiſtances were afforded them, it would not be at all detrimental to the intereſts either of truth or virtue.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Time of writing the Goſpels, eſpecially, the firſt three.

SECT. I.

That the Goſpels are not mentioned, nor referred to, in the Epiſtles of the New Teſtament.

EUSEBE intimates, that *(a)* many before him ſuppoſed, that when *Paul* in his epiſtle ſpeaks of *his own goſpel*, he intended the Goſpel according to *Luke*. We will therefore conſider thoſe texts, and ſome other of a like kind.

I. St. *Paul* ſays Rom. ii. 16. . . *in the day, when God ſhall judge the ſecrets of men, according to my goſpel.* The ſame phraſe occurs again ch. xvi. 25. and 2 Tim. ii. 8. *Remember, that Jeſus Chriſt, of the ſeed of David,*

(a) Φασὶ δὲ, ὡς ἄρα τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐυαγγελίε μνημονέυειν ὁ παῦλος ἐιωθεν, ὁπηνίκα ὡς περὶ ἰδίε τινὸς ἐυαγγελίε γράφων ἔλεγε, κατὰ τὸ ἐυαγγέλιόν με. *Euſ. H. E. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *p.* 73. *D.*

vid, was raiſed from the dead, according to my goſpel.

In all which places, I apprehend, it muſt be reaſonable to underſtand, not any written Goſpel, or hiſtorie of Jeſus Chriſt: but the doctrine of the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt, which had been preached by *Paul*. Which is alſo the opinion of learned modern interpreters in general.

II. 2 Cor. viii. 18. *And we have ſent with him the brother, whoſe praiſe is in the goſpel, throughout all the churches.*

Many have been of opinion, that St. *Luke* is the *brother*, here intended, and that St. *Paul* refers to *Luke*'s written Goſpel. This *(b)* is ſaid to be *Origen*'s interpretation. But I do not clearly perceive it. *Origen (c)* ſpeaking of the four Goſpels, ſays: "The *(d)* third is that according to *Luke*, the Goſpel, commended by *Paul*." I ſay, I do not perceive it to be clear, that *Origen* had an eye to

(b) "Who this brother was, is much conteſted. Antiquity "has carried it for St. *Luke*, *worthy of praiſe in all the churches* "*for the Goſpel, which he wrote*. The authority of this aſ- "ſertion ſeems to reſt upon the words of *Origen*, the interpo- "lated *Ignatius*, and St. *Jerome*." *So Whitby upon the Place.*

(c) Καὶ τρίτον τὸ κατὰ λεκᾶν, τὸ ὑπὸ πάυλε ἐπαινύμενον ἐυαγγέλιον. *Ap. Euſ. l.* 6. *cap.* 25. *p.* 226. *C.*

(d) See Vol. iii. p. 235.

to 2 Cor. viii. 18. He might intend Rom. ii. 16. or xvi. 25. or 2 Tim. ii. 8. However, whether it be *Origen*'s interpretation of that text, or not, it is *Jerome*'s: who writing the hiſtorie of St. *Luke* in his book of Illuſtrious Men, ſays: "He *(e)* wrote a Goſpel, of which *Paul* makes mention, ſaying: *And we have ſent with him the brother, whoſe praiſe is in the Goſpel.*" To the ſame purpoſe *(f)* alſo in the prologue to his Commentarie upon St. *Matthew:* and likewiſe in *(g)* his Commentarie upon the epiſtle to *Philemon.*

Chryſoſtom upon the place ſpeaks after this manner. "And *(h)* who is this brother? "Some ſay, *Luke:* and think, that the A- "poſtle refers to the hiſtorie, writ by him. "Others ſay, *Barnabas.* For by *goſpel* he "intends unwritten preaching." *Theophylact (i)* ſpeaks to the like purpoſe. *Theodoret*

(e) See Vol. x. p. 94. *(f) The ſame, p.* 83.

(g) De quo [Luca] et in alio loco: *Miſi,* inquit, *cum illo fratrem, cujus laus eſt in evangelio per omnes eccleſias. . .* &c. *In Philem. T.* 4. *P. i. p.* 454.

(h) Καὶ τίς ἔτός ἐσιν ὁ ἀδελφος; τινὲς μὲν τὸν λεκᾶν. Καὶ φασι, διὰ τὴν ἱσορίαν ἣνπερ ἔγραψε. Τινὲς δὲ τὸν βαρνάβαν. Καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἄγραφον κήρυγμα ἐναγγέλιον καλεῖ. *In 2. ep. ad Corinth. hom.* 18. *Tom. x.*

(i) In loc. p. 389.

doret (k) by *the brother* underſtood *Barnabas*. And therefore could not think of any written Goſpel, no ſuch work having been aſcribed to him by the ancients. *Oecumenius*'s note is to this purpoſe. " Many *(l)* " ſay, this brother is *Luke*, mentioned upon " account of the Goſpel compoſed by him. " Many others ſuppoſe him to be *Barnabas*. " For, as they ſay, unwritten preaching is " here called *goſpel*. Which is the more " likely. For what follows is more ſuitable " to *Barnabas : whoſe praiſe is in the goſpel*. " As much as to ſay : he not only preaches, " but commendably." And afterwards. " The meaning is, he not only evangelizeth, " and preacheth the goſpel admirably, and " commendably, but he has been choſen to " travel with us, with this grace alſo." Such are the ſentiments of the ancients upon this text.

Let us now obſerve the interpretations of ſome judicious moderns.

Grotius ſays : " he *(m)* does not diſlike the

(k) Τὸν τρισμακάριον βαρνάβαν τὰ εἰρημένα χαρακτηρίζει. *Theod. in loc. T. 3. p. 243.*

(l) Oecum. in loc. Tom. i. p. 663.

(m) Mihi non diſplicet ſententia illorum, qui hic Lucam deſignari putant : ita tamen ut per evangelium non intelligatur liber, qui tunc editus nondum erat, ſed ipſum munus evangeliſtae,

the opinion of thoſe, who think *Luke* to be here intended. But he does not think, that St. *Paul* refers to his book of the Goſpel, which was not then publiſhed: but to the office of an Evangeliſt, which *Luke* had diſcharged in ſeveral places, or to his preaching the goſpel. And he ſays, that *in the goſpel* may be the ſame as *by the goſpel*. So in ch. x. 14. of the ſame epiſtle."

Eſtius likewiſe ſays, that *(n)* by *goſpel* is to be underſtood preaching: not St. *Luke*'s Goſpel, which we are not certain was then publiſhed.

Le Clerc, in his French Teſtament, tranſlates in this manner: *one of our brethren, who is praiſed on account of the goſpel in all the churches.* And in his notes ſays, "that ge-" nerally St. *Luke* is here ſuppoſed to be in-" tended: though St. *Paul* refers rather to " his preaching the goſpel, than to the book " of his Goſpel."

Beauſobre

evangeliſtae, quod Lucas Pauli vice multis in locis fideliter obierat, ſive ipſa evangelii praedicatio, ut infra x. 14. ἐν *in* pro διὰ *per*. *Grot. ad 2. Cor. viii.* 18.

(n) Neque enim Paulus de Evangelio ſcripto loquitur, ſed quo modo paſſim alibi, de evangelio praedicato. Deinde, nec ſatis conſtat, Evangelium Lucae tum editum fuiſſe, quando Paulus hanc epiſtolam ſcripſit. *Eſt. in loc.*

Beauſobre tranſlates after this manner: *one of the brethren, who has made himſelf famous in all the churches by* [preaching] *the goſpel.* And ſays in his notes: "that though "ſome of the ancients have hereby under-"ſtood St. *Luke*, and his Goſpel; he thinks, "that by *the goſpel* is here intended the "preaching of the goſpel. Beſides, there is "no proof, that St. *Luke* had as yet writ his "Goſpel. It is rather reaſonable to think, "he had not."

Upon the whole, though we cannot certainly ſay, who is *the brother, whoſe praiſe was in the goſpel:* whether *(o) Luke*, or *Barnabas*, or *Silas*, or *Apollos:* I preſume we are ſufficiently warranted to ſay, that by *goſpel* is here intended neither the goſpel according to *Luke*, nor any other written Goſpel whatever.

III. 1 Tim. vi. 20. *O Timothie, keep that which is committed to thy truſt.*

Hereby ſome have been diſpoſed to underſtand a written Goſpel. But they are not favored by the beſt interpreters. *Grotius* ſays, that *(p)* this depoſit, or thing committed to *Timothie*'s

(o) Vid. Eſt. in 2. *Cor. viii.* 18. *et Beauſobr. in vez.* 18. *et* 23.

(p) Vocat autem *depoſitum* ſacram doctrinam evangelii, quia

Tomothie's truſt, is the ſacred doctrine of the goſpel. *Eſtius (q)* ſays the ſame. I place below likewiſe *(r)* a part of *Beza*'s note upon this text. *Le Clerc* in his notes explains it thus: "the doctrine of the goſpel, which "was a ſacred depoſit, committed by the "Apoſtles to their diſciples." And *Beauſobre* thus: "the doctrine, which had been committed to, or entruſted with *Timothie*." See alſo, ſays he, 1. Tim. i. 18. and 2. Tim. ii. 2. I ſay no more to this text.

IV. 2. Tim. i. 13. 14. *Hold faſt the form of ſound words, which thou haſt heard of me. ... That good thing, which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghoſt, which dwelleth in us.*

Hereby ſome may underſtand a written Goſpel, or hiſtorie of Jeſus Chriſt. Nevertheleſs, I think, I need not add much here to what has been already ſaid of the pre-

quia et res eſt alterius, nempe Chriſti, et paſtoribus fida ejus cuſtodia incumbit. *Grot. ad* 1. *Tim. vi.* 20.

(q) Iterum ſerio et graviter admonet, ut acceptam fidei doctrinam conſervet, ne locum relinquat ulli peregrino dogmati. Nomine *depoſiti* metaphorice ſignificatur doctrina ſucceſſori credita, ac per manus tradita. *Eſt. in loc.*

(r) Depoſitum proculdubio vocat ſanam evangelii doctrinam, et dona quaecunque ad Eccleſiae aedificationem, veluti depoſitum, Deus commiſerat Timotheo. *Bez. in loc.*

ceding text, it being nearly parallel. The meaning of both is much the ſame. *Timothie* is here again exhorted, and required, to retain with all fidelity thoſe *ſound words*, that pure doctrine of the goſpel, which he had been taught by the Apoſtle, and had often heard from him.

It does not appear, then, that there are in the apoſtolical epiſtles of the New Teſtament any references to written Goſpels, or hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt. I do not ſay, this is a proof, that no ſuch hiſtories were then written. Nevertheleſs, I have thought it not improper to ſhew, that there is no notice taken of any ſuch hiſtories in theſe epiſtles: and therefore they cannot afford any evidence of their being then writ and publiſhed. I think likewiſe, that it was not amiſs to embrace this occaſion to ſhew the true meaning of ſome texts, which have been often miſinterpreted.

SECT.

SECT. II.

Obſervations of ancient Chriſtian Writers, leading to the true time, when the Goſpels were writ.

1. SAYS *Irenaeus*, as formerly *(s)* quoted, "For *(t)* we have not received the "knowledge of the way of our ſalvation "from any others, than thoſe, by whom the "goſpel has been brought to us. Which "goſpel they firſt preached, and afterwards "by the will of God committed to writing, "that for time to come it might be the "foundation and pillar of our faith. Nor "may any ſay, that they preached, before

(s) See Vol. i. p. 353.

(t) Non enim per alios diſpoſitionem ſalutis noſtrae cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc praeconaverunt, poſtea vero per Dei voluntatem in ſcripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei noſtrae futurum. Nec enim fas eſt dicere, quoniam ante praedicaverunt, quam perfectam haberent agnitionem, ſicut quidam audent dicere, gloriantes, emendatores ſe eſſe Apoſtolorum. Poſtea enim quam ſurrexit Dominus noſter a mortuis, & induti ſunt ſupervenientis Spiritus Sancti virtutem ex alto, de omnibus adimpleti ſunt, & habuerant perfectam agnitionem, exierunt in fines terrae, ea quae a Deo nobis bona ſunt evangelizantes, & coeleſtem pacem hominibus annunciantes: qui quidem & omnes pariter & ſinguli eorum habentes evangelium Dei. *Iren. adv. Haer. l.* 3. *cap.* 1.

" they had a compleat knowledge of the " doctrine of the goſpel. For after that " our Lord roſe from the dead, and they " [the Apoſtles] were endowed from above " with the power of the Holy Ghoſt coming " down upon them, they received a perfect " knowledge of all things. They then went " forth to all the ends of the earth, declar- " ing to men the bleſſing of heavenly peace, " having all of them, and every one alike, " the goſpel of God."

He then proceeds to ſpeak of the Goſpels of the four Evangeliſts ſeverally, and the times and occaſions of writing them. All which will be taken down by us hereafter in proper places. Here is ſufficient to induce us to think, that the written Goſpels, or hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt, were not publiſhed, till ſome good while after our Lord's aſcenſion. For the Apoſtles firſt preached, he ſays, before they wrote.

2. Says *Euſebe* in a long paſſage formerly quoted: " Thoſe *(u)* admirable and truly " divine men, the Apoſtles of Chriſt,—— " neither knew, nor attempted, to deliver the " doctrine of their maſter with the artifice " and eloquence of words . . . Nor were they " greatly

(u) Vol. viii. p. 90. . . 92.

" greatly concerned about the writing of " books, being engaged in a more excellent " miniſtrie, which is above all human power. " Inſomuch that *Paul*, the moſt able of all " in the furniture both of words and thoughts, " has left nothing in writing, beſide a few " epiſtles .... Nor were the reſt of our Sa- " viour's followers unacquainted with theſe " things, as the ſeventy diſciples, and many " others, beſide the twelve Apoſtles. Ne- " vertheleſs of all the diſciples of our Lord, " *Matthew* and *John* only have left us any " memoirs: who too, as we have been in- " formed, were compelled to write by a " kind of neceſſity." And what follows.

3. This paſſage ſhould be compared with another of *(x) Origen*. And they who pleaſe may alſo conſult our remarks (*) upon what has been now tranſcribed from *Euſebe*. Which may be of uſe to caution us, not to be too precipitate in giving a very early date to the Goſpels, as if they were writ immediatly after our Lord's aſcenſion: when there is reaſon to think, they were not writ, till after numerous converts had been made, who expreſſed their deſires to have written hiſto-

(x) See Vol. iii. p. 236. *(*) Vol. viii. p. 124, .. 137.*

ries of what they had heard, for refreſhing their memories.

4. Says *Theodore*, Biſhop of *Mopſueſtia*, in the later part of the fourth centurie, about the year 394. "After *(y)* the Lord's aſ-
"cenſion to heaven the diſciples ſtaid a good
"while at *Jeruſalem*, viſiting the cities in it's
"neighborhood, preaching chiefly to the
"Jews: until the great *Paul*, called by the
"divine grace, was appointed to preach the
"goſpel to Gentils openly. And in proceſſe
"of time Divine Providence, not allowing
"them to be confined to any one part of the
"earth, made way for conducting them to re-
"mote countreys. *Peter* went to *Rome*, the
"others elſewhere. *John*, in particular, took
"up his abode at *Epheſus*, viſiting however
"at ſeaſons the ſeveral parts of *Aſia* . . . . .
"About this time the other Evangeliſts,
"*Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*, publiſhed their
"Goſpels, which were ſoon ſpread all over
"the world, and were received by all the
"faithful in general with great regard." . . . .
He proceeds to ſay, "that nevertheleſs,
"the Chriſtians in *Aſia*, having brought
"thoſe Goſpels to him, earneſtly entreated
"him to write a farther account of ſuch
"things,

(y) See *Vol. ix. p.* 403. 404.

" things, as were needful to be known, and " had been omitted by the reſt. With " which requeſt he complied."

This remarkable paſſage, upon which divers obſervations were made, when it was firſt quoted, may diſpoſe us to think, that all the four Goſpels were writ about the ſame time, and that none of them were publiſhed till after, or about the ſixtieth year of our Lord's Nativity.

5. By divers ancient Chriſtian writers it is ſaid, that *(z) Mark*, the diſciple and interpreter of *Peter*, at the deſire of the brethren of *Rome*, wrote a ſhort Goſpel, according to what he had heard related by *Peter*. So *Jenome (a)* beſide others, as before quoted, in his book of Illuſtrious Men.

St. *Peter*, I reckon, did not come to *Rome* before the reign of *Nero*, probably, not till the ſecond time that *Paul* was in that city, in the year 63. or 64. And yet, at this time, the Chriſtians at *Rome* deſired *Mark* to give them in writing an account of *Peter*'s preaching, for refreſhing their memories concerning what the Apoſtle had ſaid of Chriſt, and his doctrine. The conſequence

(z) See Vol. i. p. 247. .. 249. *ii.* 472.. 489. *viii.* 305. .. 306. *xi. p.* 31. *(a) Vol. x. p.* 92.

is manifeſt. They had not then any written Goſpel in their hands. Nor did they know, that there was one. "The truth is, ſays "Mr. *Jones (b)*, if St. *Mark*, or any one elſe, "had had St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, at *Rome*, "there would have been no need of St. "*Mark*'s writing."

Theſe are general obſervations in the ancients, or deduced from them, which may be of no ſmall uſe to lead us to the true time of writing the firſt three Goſpels.

SECT. III.

That the firſt three Goſpels were publiſhed before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, which happened in the year of the Chriſtian epoch LXX.

CONcerning this I tranſcribe below *(c)* a very good argument of *Le Clerc* from his Diſſertation upon the four Evangeliſts. The

(b) Vindication of the former part of St. Matthew's Goſpel p. 54. *chap. vi.*

(c) Quinetiam, ſi ex Veterum nonnullorum teſtimoniis antea adductis, de re judicemus, affirmabimus, Matthaeum, Marcum, et Lucam, ante ultima Neronis tempora, quibus occiſi ſunt Petrus et Paulus, Evangelia ſcripſiſſe. Quod non levi argumento confirmari poteſt, ducto ex Matth. cap. xxiv. Marc.

The Jewiſh war began, according *(d)* to *Joſephus*, in the Month of May, in the 66. year of the Chriſtian epoch, and ended in September, in the year 70. in the deſolation of the city of *Jeruſalem* and the temple. And I think, it may be ſhewn to be very probable, that the firſt three Goſpels were writ before the year 66. when the final troubles and calamities of the Jewiſh People were coming on.

This muſt appear to have a great deal of probability from the predictions therein recorded concerning the deſtruction of the temple, the overthrow of the city of *Jeruſalem*, the ruin of the Jewiſh State and People in *Judea*, together with divers circumſtances of

Marc. xiii. Luc. xxi. ubi narratur Jeroſolymae excidii praedictio, quaſi rei etiamnum futurae, eo tempore, quo Evangelia ab iis ſcribebantur. Si enim eam praedicationem poſt eventum ſcripſiſſent Evangeliſtae memorati, verbulo ſaltem monuiſſent, praedictionem fuiſſe eventu confirmatam. Quod tantum abeſt ut faciant, ut Matthaeus et Marcus hac admonitione, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω, *qui legit, intelligat*, quam ſubjiciunt praeſagiis Jeroſolymitanae cladis, admonere videantur Chriſtianos in Judaea viventes, ut diligenter futura illa praeſagia attendant, quo poſſint vitae ſuae conſulere. Vide Matth. xxiv. 15. Marc. xiii. 14. et ad ea loca interpretes. *Cleric. Diſſ. iii. de quatuor Evangeliis. num. vii. p.* 541.

(d) Vid. Joſeph. Antiq. Jud. l. 20. *cap. xi. n. c. &c. B. I. l.* 6. *cap. x.*

of theſe events, and many troubles and calamities preceding them. Theſe predictions are recorded in the hiſtories of our Saviour's miniſtrie, which we call Goſpels, without any the leſt hint, either expreſs and deſigned, or accidentally dropping from the writers, that thoſe predictions had been fulfilled and verified, or that the things ſpoken of had happened. Thoſe prophecies are recorded in Matth. xxiii. 34. . . 39. and xxiv. Mark xiii. Luke xxi. St. *Luke* has alſo elſwhere recorded the affectionate concern, which our Lord expreſſed in the view and proſpect of thoſe impending evils. ch. xiii. 34. 35. and xix. 41. . . 44. Theſe things are alſo referred to, and ſpoken of, in divers other diſcourſes, ſome plain, ſome parabolical, or otherwiſe figurative: as Matth. xxi. 33. . . 46. xxii. 1. . . 7. Mark xii. 1. . . 12. Luke xiii. 1. . . 9. xx. 9. . . 20. xxi. 5. . . 13. In none of all which places does there appear any intimation, that the things ſpoken of were come to paſs. And in recording the preſages of this final and total overthrow of the Jewiſh nation the hiſtorians have inſerted warnings and admonitions, proper to excite the attention of readers, and induce thoſe who lived in *Judea*, to take care of their

own

own ſafety, without delay. Matt. xxiv. 15. . . . 18. *When ye therefore ſhall ſee the abomination of deſolation, ſpoken of by Daniel the Prophet, ſtand in the holy place, (whoſo readeth, let him underſtand:) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains. Let him which is on the houſe-top not come down to take any thing out of his houſe. Neither let him which is in the field, return back to take his cloths.* And what follows. And to the like purpoſe in Mark xiii. 14. . . 16. When theſe diſcourſes were recorded, the things ſpoken of had not yet come to paſs. There were men living, to whom theſe admonitions might be uſeful for ſecuring their ſafety.

Moreover, though theſe predictions muſt have been recorded, before they were accompliſhed; I think, the fulfilment was then near at hand, and not far off. This ſeems to be implied in that expreſſion: *Let him that readeth, underſtand.* And indeed it muſt have been difficult and hazardous to publiſh ſuch things in writing. How offenſive theſe ſayings muſt have been to the Jewiſh People, and perhaps to ſome others likewiſe, is eaſie to conceive from the nature of the things ſpoken of. And it may be confirmed by divers inſtances. When our Lord had ſpoken

the

the parable of the vineyard, let out to husbandmen, recorded in Luke xx. 9. . . 18. it is added by the Evangeliſt. ver. 19. 20. *And the Chief Prieſts, and the Scribes, the ſame hour ſought to lay hands on him. But they feared the people. For they perceived, that he had ſpoken this parable againſt them. And they watched him, and ſent forth ſpies, which ſhould feign themſelves juſt men, that they might take hold of his words, that ſo they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the Governour.* And among the odious charges brought againſt our Saviour by falſe witneſſes, this was one, *that he ſaid: I am able to deſtroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days.* Matth. xxvi. 61. With this he was reproached likewiſe, when hanging on the croſs. xxvii. 40. The like offenſive charges were brought againſt *Stephen.* Acts. vi. 14. *We have heard him ſay, that this Jeſus of Nazareth ſhall deſtroy this place, and ſhall change the cuſtoms, which Moſes delivered to us.* And, poſſibly, he did ſay ſomewhat not very different. So likewiſe St. *Matthew*, and the other Apoſtles, might repeat in the hearing of many what Chriſt had ſaid to them, and in part to others alſo, concerning the overthrow of the temple, and the

the Jewiſh ſtate. Yea, very probably, they had often repeated theſe things to attentive hearers. But ſpeaking and writing are different. And I apprehend, it could not have been ſafe, nor prudent, to record theſe predictions, (many of which are very plain, and all intelligible,) ſoon after our Lord's aſcenſion.

Theſe prophecies therefore of our Lord, as recorded in the firſt three Goſpels, afford at once an argument, that they were written and publiſhed before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem:* and that they were not publiſhed many years before it, or however, not many years before the commencement of the war at the time above-mentioned.

SECT. IV.

An Argument, ſhewing the true Time of writing the Goſpels, taken from the Acts, and the begining of St. Luke's Goſpel.

NONE can ſuppoſe, that the book of the Acts of the Apoſtles was compoſed before the year 62. or 63. as the hiſtorie is there brought down to the period of St. *Paul*'s two years impriſonment at *Rome*.

And,

And, very probably, the Goſpel, to which St. *Luke* refers at the begining of that book, had not been writ long before. This I ſuppoſe to be now the common opinion of learned men. And for giving the greateſt ſatisfaction to all my readers, I ſhall tranſcribe below at large the ſentiments of ſeveral to this purpoſe, ſuch as that of the late *(e)* Mr *Jones*, and *(f) Eſtius*, *(g) Mill*, (*) *Dod-*

(e) "Hence we ſee near to what time this hiſtorie of the Acts was written: viz. either in the year 62. or not long after: it being altogether probable, that St. *Luke* would not defer writing long after his departure from St. *Paul*. Which ſeems to have been now, when the Apoſtle was ſet at liberty from his confinement at *Rome*... That he wrote both the Goſpel and the Acts in the ſame year, ſeems very probable: as it is certain, that one of them is only to be looked upon as the ſecond part, or continuation of the other." *Jones New and Full Method, &c. Part.* 4. *ch. xvi. Vol.* 3. *p.* 158. *See him alſo ch. xi. p.* 115.

(f) Deinde, nec ſatis conſtat, Evangelium Lucae jam tum editum fuiſſe, quando Paulus hanc epiſtolam ſcripſit. Nam Acta quidem Apoſtolica ſcripſiſſe videtur ſtatim poſt Evangelium, tanquam ejuſdem voluminis libros primum et ſecundum. Scripſit autem Acta poſt biennium Pauli Romae commorantis, id eſt, multis annis poſt hanc epiſtolam. Quare circa idem tempus Evangelium ab eo ſcriptum fuiſſe, credibile eſt. *Eſt. ad* 2. *Cor. viii.* 18.

(g) Voluminis hujus D. Lucae partem poſteriorem, ſeu λόγον δεύτερον quod attinet, librum dico Actuum Apoſtolorum, haud dubium eſt. ... quin is ſcriptus ſit ſtatim poſt λόγον πρῶτον, ſive Evangelium. *Mill. Prol. num.* 121.

(*) *Dodwell*, and *(h) Baſnage:* though the thing appears to me very obvious. And if ſo, we have gained very nearly the date of one of the four Goſpels.

Grotius ſuppoſeth, that *(i)* when *Paul* left *Rome*, he went into *Spain:* and that at the ſame time *Luke* went into *Greece*, and there wrote both his Goſpel and the Acts. *Jerome* ſuppoſeth, that *(k)* the book of the Acts was writ at *Rome*. But that makes no difference in point of time: ſince he allows, that it reaches to the end of St. *Paul*'s two years impriſonment at *Rome*.

This

(*) Sunt enim Acta Δεύτερος ejuſdem operis λόγος, cujus πρῶτον λόγου ipſe ſuum agnoſcit Evangelium. Act. i. 1. *Dodw. Diſſ. Iren. i. num. xxxix.*

(h) Non multum vero interjectum fuiſſe temporis inter Actorum Apoſtolicorum et Evangelii confectionem, conjectura ex praefatione ad Theophilum duci poteſt. *Primum quidem librum confeci.* . . Actuum ergo liber continatio eſt, ſerieſque Evangelii, . . . Multum vero abiiſſe temporis antequam a priore libro omnibus numeris expleto ad poſteriorem tranſiret Lucas, nulla ratione cogimur ad credendum. &c. *Baſnag. Ann.* 60. *num. xxviii.*

(i) Librum autem et hunc, et qui de Actibus Apoſtolorum, ſcriptum arbitror, non multo poſtquam Paulus Româ abiit in Hiſpaniam. Nam in id tempus deſinit Actuum liber, qui ſi ſerius ſcriptus eſſet, in ulteriora etiam tempora narrationem protenderet. Puto autem, Româ iiſſe Lucam in Achaiam, atque ibi ab eo conſcriptos quos habemus libros. *Grot. Pr. in Evang. Lucae.*

(k) See Vol. x. p. 94. 95.

This one conſideration, ſo far as I am able to judge, overthrows the opinion, that St. *Luke*'s Goſpel was writ about fifteen years after our Lord's aſcenſion. Yea, it evidently ſhews, that it was not writ till the year 60. or afterwards.

And the begining of St. *Luke*'s Goſpel affords an argument, that the other two Goſpels of St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*, were not writ ſooner. For this Evangeliſt knew nothing of them. Conſequently, they were not then writ, and publiſhed: or, but lately. Every word of his introduction ſhews this. Let us obſerve it.

Foraſmuch as many have taken in hand to ſet forth in order a declaration of thoſe things, which are moſt ſurely believed among us. . . . It ſeemed good unto me alſo, having had perfect underſtanding of all things from the very firſt, to write unto thee in order, moſt excellent Theophilus: that thou mighteſt know the certainty of thoſe things, wherein thou haſt been inſtructed.

When St. *Luke* ſays, that *many* had undertaken to write hiſtories of our Saviour, he cannot mean *Matthew* alone, nor *Matthew* and *Mark* only. For they are not *many*. He muſt intend them, and others, or ſome different

different from them. Which laſt will appear moſt likely, if we conſider what there follows.

Of thoſe *many* he ſays, they *had taken in hand*, undertaken, or attempted. St. *Luke* would not have ſpoken thus of *Matthew*, or *Mark*. Indeed, we may ſuppoſe, that *(l)* thoſe narrations, to which St. *Luke* refers, were not falſe and fabulous, nor heretical. But they were defective.

Grotius ſays, the *(m)* word is of a midle meaning. And that it does not neceſſarily imply, that the writers, here intended, had failed to perform what they undertook.

Nevertheleſs the ancient Chriſtians, to ſeveral of whom the Greek language was natural, underſtood the word differently. And their judgements muſt be of value in this

(l) Quod iſtos ait Lucas, non ſatis commode praeſtitiſſe; minime tamen, opinor, fabuloſas, immo etiam impias narrationes intelligens, tandem Eccleſiae, ſub Nicodemi, ... Thomae, Aegyptiorum nominibus impudentiſſime obtruſas. Nec tamen hic recte colligunt, Lucam poſt Matthaeum et Marcum hanc ſuam hiſtoriam edidiſſe. *Bez. in Luc. cap. i. ver.* 1.

(m) Επεχείρησαν. *aggreſſi ſunt.* Bene notavit vir eruditiſſimus, vocem eſſe mediam: neque enim ex ea colligi poſſe, non praeſtitum ab illis ſcriptoribus quod aggreſſi ſunt. *Grot. in loc.*

caſe. *Origen*'s obſervations upon St. *Luke*'s introduction may be ſeen. vol. iii. p. 316. . . 319. where he ſays, " St. *Luke*'s expreſ- " ſion, *taken in hand*, implies a tacit ac- " cuſation of thoſe, who without the gift " of the Holy Ghoſt took upon them to " write Goſpels. For *Matthew*, and *Mark*, " and *Luke*, and *John*, did not *take in hand* " to write: but being full of the Holy Ghoſt " wrote Goſpels." In which words, and afterwards, continually, he diſtinguiſheth the four Evangeliſts from the writers, referred to by St. *Luke*. To the like purpoſe (*n*) *Ambroſe*, who either copied, or cloſely imitated *Origen*. And ſays *Euſebe*: " *Luke* (*o*) " at the begining aſſigns the reaſon of his " writing, declaring, that whereas many " others had raſhly undertaken to compoſe " relations of the things, which were moſt " firmly believed, he therefore thought him- " ſelf obliged, in order to divert us from the " uncertain relations of others, to deliver in " his Goſpel a certain account of thoſe things, " of which he was fully aſſured." Which paſſage

(*n*) *See Vol. ix. p.* 245.

(*o*) . . δηλῶν ὡς ἄρα πολλῶν καὶ ἄλλων προπετέστερον ἐπιτη- δευκότων διήγησιν ποιήσασθαι ὧν αὐτὸς πεπληροφόρητο λόγων κ. λ. *Euſeb. l.* 3. *c.* 24. *p.* 96. *C.*

paſſage was tranſcribed by us (*p*) formerly. And *Epiphanius*, whom (*q*) I now place below, plainly affixed a diſadvantageous meaning to this word.

Beauſobre readily allows, that (*r*) we ought to follow the ancients in their interpretation of this word, and to ſuppoſe, that St. *Luke* here ſpeaks of ſome attempts, and eſſays, that had not been well executed.

This may be ſufficient to ſatisfy us, that St. *Luke* does not ſpeak of any of our Evangeliſts. Mr. (*) *Dodwell* was of the ſame opinion.

But we may have yet farther aſſurance of it by obſerving what St. *Luke* ſays of himſelf,

(*p*) *Vol. viii. p.* 95.

(*q*) .. φάσκων, ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν· ἵνα τινὰς ἐπιχειρητὰς δέξῃ· φημὶ δὲ τὸς περὶ κήρινθον, καὶ μήρινθον, καὶ τὸς ἄλλους. *H.* 51. *num. vii. p.* 428.

(*r*) Ce mot Grec, ἐπεχείρησαν, eſt certainement tres equivoque, et peut fort bien ſignifier *des tentatives malheureuſes, des efforts qui ont mal réuſſi.* St. Epiphane ne l'a pas entendu autrement. Origene de même, dans ſa preface ſur S. Luc. et après lui la plupart des Interprêtes Grecs. Quand il s'agit de la ſignification des termes Grecs, et que les auteurs Grecs, qui les expliquent, n'ont aucun interêt à leur donner des ſens forcés, ces derniers ſemblent dignes de creance. *Beauſ. Remarques ſur Luc. ch. i. p.* 100.

(*) Ut plane alios fuiſſe neceſſe ſit evangelicae hiſtoriae ſcriptores a Luca viſos, a noſtris, quos habemus Evangeliſtis. *Diſſ. Iren. i. num. xxxix.*

and his own deſign. Which is to this purpoſe: "That it had ſeemed good to him, "to ſend to *Theophilus* in writing a diſtinct "and particular hiſtorie of Jeſus Chriſt: "that he might better know, and be more "fully confirmed in the truth of thoſe things, "in which he had been inſtructed by word "of mouth."

In my opinion, this implies a ſuppoſition, that *Theophilus* had not yet in his hands any good written hiſtorie of the words and works of Jeſus Chriſt.

Conſequently St. *Luke* at the year 62. and poſſibly ſomewhat later, did not know of St. *Matthew's* and St. *Mark's* Goſpels. And therefore we muſt ſuppoſe, that they were not yet writ and publiſhed, or however, but lately. For if they had been publiſhed ſeveral years, St. *Luke*, who had accompanied *Paul* in *Greece*, *Aſia*, *Paleſtine*, and *Rome*, could not have been unacquainted with them.

This argument appears to me valid. At leſt I cannot diſcern, where it fails. It has long ſeemed to me a clear and obvious argument, that the Goſpels of St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* were not writ till the year 60.

60. or afterwards. For if they had been writ sooner, they would by this time have been in the hands of St. *Luke*, and *Theophilus*, and all the faithful in general. And St. *Luke* could not have expressed himself, as he does in this introduction: nor indeed would he have writ any Gospel at all.

CHAP. V.

St. Matthew,

Apoſtle, and Evangeliſt.

I. *His Hiſtorie.* II. *Teſtimonies of ancient Writers to his Goſpel.* III. *Remarks upon them, for diſcerning the Time of this Goſpel.* IV. *Characters of Time in the Goſpel itſelf.* V. *The Language, in which it was writ.*

I. *Matthew* (A) called alſo (B) *Levi*, ſon of (C) *Alpheus*, was a Publican, or (D) Toll-gatherer under the *Romans*. He was, undoubtedly, a native

(A) The hiſtorie of our Lord's calling this diſciple is in Matth. ix. 9. . . 13. Mark ii. 13. . . 16. Luke v. 27. . . 32.

(B) This Evangeliſt, in his account of his being called by Chriſt, names himſelf *Matthew*, ch. ix. 9. But St. *Mark* and St. *Luke* in their accounts of it call him *Levi*. Mark ii. 14.

a native of *Galilee*, as the reſt of Chriſt's Apoſtles

ii. 14. Luke v. 27. & 29. This has induced *Grotius* to argue, that *Matthew* and *Levi* are different perſons: though he cannot deny, that the circumſtances of the hiſtorie lead us to think, one and the ſame perſon to be intended. Video omnes hodie ita exiſtimare, hunc eundem eſſe, quem Marcus & Lucas Levi nominant. Et ſane congruunt circumſtantiae. *Grot. ad Mat. ix.* 9. It is obſervable, that *Heracleon*, the *Valentinian*, as cited by *Clement* of *A. Str. l.* 4. *p.* 502. reckons among Apoſtles, who had not ſuffered martyrdom, *Matthew*, *Philip*, *Thomas*, and *Levi*. By *Levi*, probably, *Heracleon* meant *Lebbeus*, otherwiſe called *Thaddeus*. *Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l.* 4. *cap.* 5. *T.* 3. *p.* 126. *Coteler. Annot. in Conſtitut. l.* 8. *cap.* 22. *Dodw. Diſſ. Iren. i. n.* 24. It is certain, that *Euſebe* and *Jerome* thought *Matthew* and *Levi* to be only two names of one and the ſame perſon. See in this work, vol. viii. p. 83. Vol. x. p. 83. and 89. Moreover, in the catalogues of the Apoſtles, which are in Mark iii. 18. Luke vi. 15. Acts i. 13. is the name *Matthew*. It is likely, that *Levi* was the name, by which the Apoſtle was called in the former part of his life: and *Matthew* the name, by which he was beſt known afterwards.

(c) That is ſaid by St. *Mark* only ch. ii. 14. But we do not perceive, who *Alpheus* was. *Tillemont* obſerves to this purpoſe. " St. *Mark* gives him the ſurname of *Alpheus*: τὸν " τοῦ ἀλφαίου. Which may have been the name of his father. " This has given occaſion to ſome of the ancients, and to all " the modern Greeks, to ſay, that *James* the ſon of *Alpheus* " was his brother: though it be entirely deſtitute of all pro- " bability. Quoiqu'il il n'y ait en cela aucune apparence." *Tillem. S. Matt. init. Mem. T. i.*

Dr. *Doddridge*, Family Expoſitor. Sect. 44. Vol. i. p. 280. ſays roundly, " that *Matthew*, otherwiſe called *Levi*, was the " ſon of *Alpheus*, and the brother of *James*. Comp. Mark iii.

Apoſtles were: but of what city in that countrey, or which tribe of the people of *Iſrael*, is not known.

As he ſat at the *Receipt of Cuſtom*, by the *ſea-ſide*, in the city of *Capernaum*, or near it, *Jeſus ſaid unto him: Follow me. And he aroſe, and followed him.* Which needs not to be underſtood to imply, that *Matthew* did not make up his accounts with thoſe, by whom he had been employed, and entruſted.

After-

" 18. Luke vi. 15. Acts i. 13." But I do not think, thoſe texts can afford ſufficient proof, that *Matthew*, and *James* the ſon of *Alpheus*, had the ſame father, and were brothers. If that had been the caſe, their relation to each other would have been hinted, or plainly declared in the Goſpels.

I do not love bold conjectures in others, and would not indulge my-ſelf in them. But I ſuſpect, that theſe words in Mark ii. 14. *ſon of Alpheus*, τὸν τῦ ἀλφάιυ, are an interpolation, ſome how or other, undeſignedly, and accidentally inſerted in that place. What is truly ſaid of *James*, has been alſo applied to *Matthew*. The curious may do well to conſider, whether this conjecture be not countenanced by the ſingularity of the thing, ſaid no where elſe, and by the various readings of that text, which may be ſeen in *Beza*, *Mill*, and *Wetſtein*.

(D) " His office ſeems more particularly to have conſiſted in " gathering the cuſtoms of commodities, that came by the ſea " of *Galilee*, and the tribute, which paſſengers were to pay, " that went by water." *Cave's Lives of the Apoſtles*, *p.* 177.

Afterwards (E) he made an entertainment, at his houſe, where Jeſus was preſent, and likewiſe divers of his diſciples. And there ſat at table with them many Publicans, and others, of no very reputable character in the eye of the Phariſees, who were ſtrict in external purifications, and other like obſervances. *Matthew*, it is likely, was willing to take leave of his former acquaintance in a civil manner. He was likewiſe deſirous, that they ſhould converſe with Jeſus, hoping, that they might be taken with his diſcourſe. And Jeſus, with a view of doing good, and to ſhew, that he did not diſdain any man, made no exceptions to this deſign of his new diſciple. Nor is it unlikely, that the ends aimed at were obtained, in part at leſt. *Matthew*'s former friends did, probably, diſcern ſomewhat extraordinarie in Jeſus,

(E) That this entertainment was not made by *Matthew* on the very day that Chriſt called him to attend on him, is argued by Mr. *Jones* in his Vindication of the former part of *St. Matthew*'s Goſpel, p. 129... 137. and by Dr. *Doddridge*. Family Expoſitor, Vol. i. ſect. LXXI. note *(a)*. who ſays: "It is certain, the feaſt was after the day of his calling, perhaps, ſome months after: when he had made up his accompts, and regularly paſſed his buſineſs into other hands: which, to be ſure, from a principle of juſtice, as well as prudence, he would take care to do."

Jeſus, ſo far as to induce them to think, it was not unreaſonable in him to leave his former employment, for the ſake of the companie of Jeſus, and the advantages, which in time he might receive from him. The Phariſees made reflections. But our Lord vindicated himſelf. And all the three Evangeliſts have recorded this inſtance of our Lord's amiable familiarity and condeſcenſion, which is one of the diſtinctions of his ſhining character. And it is a proof, that at the time of their writing, ſeverally, their Goſpels, they were molded into the temper and principles of him, whoſe hiſtorie they wrote.

Jeſus now called *Matthew* to be with him, to be a witneſſe of his words and works, and he put him into the number of his Apoſtles. Thenceforward he continued with the Lord Jeſus. And after his aſcenſion, he was at *Jeruſalem*, and partook of the gift of the Holy Ghoſt, with the other Apoſtles. Together with them he bore teſtimonie to the reſurrection of Jeſus: and, as may be ſuppoſed, preached for ſome while at *Jeruſalem*, and in the ſeveral parts of *Judea*, confirming his doctrine with miracles, which God

God enabled him to perform in the name of Jeſus.

In his own catalogue of the twelve Apoſtles, ch. x. he is the eighth in order. In St. *Mark*'s ch. iii. and St. *Luke*'s ch. vi. he is the ſeventh. He is alſo named in the eighth place, Acts i. 13. Nor is there any particular account in the Goſpels of the call of any of the Apoſtles, except his, and four other, *Andrew* and *Peter*, and the two ſons of *Zebedee*, who were called before (F).

Clement of *Alexandria* ſays, that (*a*) the Apoſtle *Matthew* uſed a very ſparing diet, eating no fleſh, but only vegetables. But, perhaps, this is ſaid upon the ground only of ſome uncertain tradition, not well atteſted.

Socrates, in the fifth centurie, ſays, that (*b*) when the Apoſtles went abroad to preach

(F) St. *John* ſays ch. i. 43. *The day following, Jeſus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and ſaith unto him: Follow me.* If *Philip* was then called by our Lord to be an Apoſtle, he ought to be added to the others above named.

(*a*) Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν ὁ ἀπόστολος σπερμάτων, καὶ ἀκροδρύων, καὶ λαχάνων, ἄνευ κρεῶν μετελάμβανεν. *Clem. Paed. l.* 2. *p.* 148. *D.*

(*b*) Ἡνίκα οἱ ἀπόστολοι κλήρῳ τὴν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πόρειαν ἐποιοῦντο, Θωμᾶς μὲν τὴν πάρθων ἀποστολὴν ὑπεδέχετο· Ματθαῖος δὲ αἰθιοπίαν. κ. λ. *Socr. H. E. l.* 1. *c.* 19.

preach to the Gentils, *Thomas* took *Parthia* for his lot, *Matthew Ethiopia*, and *Bartholomew India*. And it is now a common opinion, that *Matthew* (*c*) died a Martyr in *Ethiopia*, in a city called *Nadabbar*, or *Naddaver*: but by what kind of death, is altogether uncertain. However, ſome others ſpeak of his preaching, and dying in *Parthia*, or *Perſia*. And the diverſity of thoſe accounts ſeems to ſhew, that they all are without good foundation.

I think, it may be of uſe to take here at length a paſſage of *Euſebe*, at the begining of the third book of his Eccleſiaſtical hiſtorie, after having in the preceding book ſpoken of the many calamities in *Judea*, when the war was juſt breaking out. "This, "ſays he, was the ſtate of things with the "Jews. But the holy Apoſtles and diſciples "of our Saviour being diſperſed abroad, "preached in the whole world. *Tho-* "*mas*, as we learn by tradition, had *Par-* "*thia* for his lot, *Andrew Scythia*, *John* "*Aſia*. Who having lived there a long "time died at *Epheſus*. *Peter*, as it ſeems, "preached to the diſperſed Jews in *Pon-*

"*tus*

(*c*) *See Cave's Lives of the Apoſtles, and his Hiſt. Lit.*

" *tus*, and *Galatia*, *Bithynia*, *Cappadocia*,
" and *Aſia*. At length coming to *Rome*, he
" was crucified, with his head downward,
" as he had deſired. What need I to ſpeak
" of *Paul*, who fully preached the goſpel of
" Chriſt from *Jeruſalem* to *Illyricum*, and
" at laſt died a Martyr at *Rome*, in the time
" of *Nero*? So ſays *Origen* expreſsly in the
" third tome of his Expoſitions of the book
" of Geneſis."

Thus writes our Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian. But, as *Valeſius* obſerves, it (*d*) is not eaſie to determine exactly, where the quotation from *Origen* begins.

However, from this paſſage, as it ſeems, we may conclude, that at the begining of the fourth centurie, there were not any certain and well atteſted accounts of the places, out of *Judea*, in which many of the Apoſtles of Chriſt preached. For if there had, *Euſebe* muſt have been acquainted with them. In particular we may hence infer, as I apprehend, that there was no certain account, whither *Matthew* went, when he left *Judea*. For there

(*d*) Cum Euſebius hic dicat, ſuperiora ex libro tertio Explanationum Origenis in Geneſim eſſe deſumta, dubitari merito poteſt, unde incipiant Origenis verba, &c. *Valeſ. Annot.* 3. *cap.* 1.

there is no notice taken of him in this paſſage. Nor does *Jerome* in his article of St. *Matthew*, in his book of Illuſtrious Men, formerly (*e*) tranſcribed at large, take any notice of the countreys, in which he preached. Nor do I recollect, that in any other of his genuine works he has ſaid any thing of the travels of this Apoſtle.

Heracleon, a learned *Valentinian*, in the ſecond centurie, as cited by *Clement* of *Alexandria*, reckons (*f*) *Matthew* among thoſe Apoſtles, who did not dye by martyrdom. Nor does *Clement* contradict him.

It is alſo obſervable, that (*g*) *Chryſoſtom* has a commendation of *Matthew*, conſiſting of divers articles: his humility, mercifulneſſe or liberality, piety, general benevolence, writing a Goſpel, finally, fortitude, inaſmuch as *he came from the preſence of the Council rejoycing*: referring, I ſuppoſe, to Acts v. 41. But ſays nothing of his martyrdom. Which may induce us to think, that there was not any

(*e*) *Vol. x. p.* 89. 90.

(*f*) Οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ σωζόμενοι ὡμολόγησαν τὴν διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ὁμολογίαν, ἀλλ' ἐξῆλθον· ἐξ ὧν ματθαῖος, φίλιππος, θωμᾶς, λευὶς, καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί. *Clem. Str. l.* 4. *p.* 502. *B.*

(*g*) *In Matth. hom.* 48. *al.* 49. *T.* 7. *p.* 491.

any tradition about it among Chriſtians at that time, or that it was not much regarded.

II. Having thus given the hiſtorie of this Apoſtle, I proceed to the conſideration of his Goſpel, one of the univerſally acknowledged books of the New Teſtament. Two things principally are to be the ſubjects of our inquirie, the time of writing it, and the language in which it was writ. And I propoſe to recite here briefly all, or moſt of the authors, that have been largely quoted in the former volumes, ſo far as relates to thoſe two particulars. *Teſtimonies to his Goſpel.*

Papias, Bp of *Hierapolis*, about A. D. 116. by ſome ſuppoſed to have been acquainted with *John* the Apoſtle, by others with *John* the Elder only, in his five books, entitled Explications of the Oracles of the Lord, which ſeem to have been collections of ancient ſtories and traditions, makes *(b)* expreſs mention of *Matthew*'s Goſpel, and ſays, that he wrote the Divine Oracles in the *Hebrew* tongue.

Irenaeus, Biſhop of *Lyons*, about the year 178, who was born in *Aſia*, and in his youth was acquainted with *Polycarp*, diſciple of St.

(*b*) *See of this work. Vol. i. p.* 242. *the ſecond edition.*

St. *John*, ſays: " *Matthew* (*i*) then among " the Jews wrote a Goſpel in their own " language, while *Peter* and *Paul* were " preaching the goſpel at *Rome*, and found- " ing [or eſtabliſhing] the church there. " And after their exit, [that is, death, or de- " parture,] *Mark* alſo the diſciple and inter- " preter of *Peter*, delivered to us in writing, " the things that had been preached by " *Peter*. And *Luke*, the companion of " *Paul*, put down in a book the goſpel " preached by him. Afterwards *John*, the " diſciple of the Lord, who leaned upon " his breaſt, likewiſe publiſhed a Goſpel, " whilſt he dwelt at *Epheſus*, in *Aſia*." In another place he ſays, " the (*k*) Goſpel ac- " cording to *Matthew* was delivered to the " Jews."

Origen, about 230. ſays, " that (*l*) ac- " cording to the tradition received by him, " the firſt Goſpel was written by *Matthew*, " once

(*i*) Ὁ μὲν δὴ ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς ἑβραίοις τῇ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ πέτρου, καὶ τοῦ παύλου ἐν ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. κ. λ. *Adv. Haer.* l. 3. cap. i. Et *ap. Euſeb. l.* 5. *c.* 8. *And in this work Vol. i. p.* 353.

(*k*) *See Vol. i. p.* 356.

(*l*) *Vol. iii. p.* 235.

" once a Publican, afterwards a Diſciple of " Jeſus Chriſt: who delivered it to the Jew- " iſh believers, compoſed in the *Hebrew* " language." And in another place he ſays, " that *(m) Matthew* wrote for the *Hebrews.*"

Says *Euſebe*, about 315, " *Matthew (n)* " having firſt preached to the *Hebrews*, " when he was about to go to other people, " delivered to them in their own language " the Goſpel according to him, by that " writing ſupplying the want of his pre- " ſence with thoſe whom he was leaving."

Athanaſius, in his Feſtal Epiſtle *(o)* does not ſay, where, or in what language, *Matthew* wrote. But in the Synopſis, aſcribed to him, it is ſaid, " that *(p) Matthew* wrote " his Goſpel in *Hebrew*, and publiſhed it at " *Jeruſalem.*"

Cyril of *Jeruſalem* ſays, " that *(q) Matthew* wrote in *Hebrew.*"

Epiphanius likewiſe ſays, " that *(r) Matthew* wrote in *Hebrew.*" And afterwards.

(m) P. 278. *(n)* *Vol. viii. p.* 92. *See alſo p.* 177.
(o) *Vol. viii. p.* 227. *(p)* P. 249.
(q) P. 271. *(r)* P. 304. *and* 305.

" *Matthew (s)* wrote firſt, and *Mark* ſoon " after him, being a follower of *Peter*, at " *Rome*." If *Mark* did not write till after *Peter* came to *Rome*, and *Matthew* but a little before him; it follows, that *Matthew*'s Goſpel was not writ ſo ſoon, as many later writers have ſuppoſed.

Gregorie Nazianzen, in his catalogue, ſays, " that *(t) Matthew* wrote for the *Hebrews*."

And *Ebedjeſu*, " that *(u) Matthew*, the firſt Evangeliſt, publiſhed his Goſpel in *Paleſtine*, writ in *Hebrew*."

Theodore of *Mopſueſtia* ſays, " that *(x)* for " a good while the Apoſtles preached chiefly " to *Jews* in *Judea*. Afterwards Providence " made way for conducting them to remote " countreys. *Peter* went to *Rome*, the reſt " elſewhere, *John*, in particular, took up his " abode at *Epheſus*. . . . About this time " the other Evangeliſts, *Matthew*, *Mark*, " and *Luke*, publiſhed their Goſpels, which " were ſoon ſpread all over the world." This ſuppoſeth a late date of the Goſpels, as was argued vol. ix. p. 405, that is, after the begining

(s) Ευθὺς δὲ μετὰ τὸν ματθαῖον ἀκόλουθος γενόμενος ὁ μάρκος τῷ ἁγίῳ πέτρῳ ἐν ῥώμῃ. *Citat. ib. p.* 305.

(t) *Vol. ix. p.* 133. *Comp. p.* 134.

(u) *P.* 216. (x) *P.* 403.

begining of *Nero*'s reign, when *Peter* went to *Rome*, and not long before the war in *Judea*, which broke out in 66. about which time *John* left that countrey, and ſettled at *Epheſus*.

Says *Jerome* in the prologue to his Commentarie upon St. *Matthew*: "The *(y)* firſt "Evangeliſt is *Matthew*, the Publican, ſur-"named *Levi*, who wrote his Goſpel in "*Judea*, in the *Hebrew* language, chiefly "for the ſake of the *Jews* that believed in "Jeſus, and did not joyn the ſhadow of "the law with the truth of the goſpel." To the like purpoſe in the article of St. *Matthew*, in his book of Eccleſiaſtical Writers: "*Matthew (z)* called alſo *Levi*, of a "Publican made an Apoſtle, firſt of all wrote "a Goſpel in *Judea* in the *Hebrew* language, "for the ſake of thoſe of the circumciſion, "who believed. Who afterwards tranſlated "it into *Greek*, is uncertain.

Chryſoſtom in the introduction to his homilies upon this Goſpel: "*Matthew (a)* is "ſaid to have writ his Goſpel at the requeſt "of the Jewiſh believers, who deſired him "to put down in writing what he had

(y) Vol. x. p. 83.
(z) P. 89. *(a) P.* 315.

" taught them by word of mouth. And " he is ſaid to have writ in *Hebrew.*" He ſpeaks with heſitation, and is not poſitive about the occaſion of writing this Goſpel, or the language, in which it was writ. Afterwards he ſays: " In *(b)* what place " each one of the Evangeliſts wrote, cannot " be ſaid with certainty."

Coſmas, of *Alexandria*, about the year 535, ſays: " *Matthew (c)* is the firſt Evan- " geliſt, that wrote a Goſpel. There being " a perſecution, when *Stephen* was ſtoned, " and he alſo being about to go from that " place, the believers entreated him to leave " with them a written inſtruction, with " which requeſt he complied." And what follows.

The Author of the Imperfect Work upon St. *Matthew*, in the ſixth centurie, about the year 560, obſerves to this purpoſe: " The " *(d)* occaſion of *Matthew*'s writing is ſaid " to be this. There being a great Perſecu- " tion in *Paleſtine*, ſo that there was danger, " leaſt all the faithful ſhould be diſperſed: " that they might not be without teaching, " though

(b) P. 316. *(c)* *Vol. xi. p.* 266.
(d) P. 327. 328.

" though they ſhould have no teachers, " they requeſted *Matthew* to write for them " a hiſtorie of all Chriſt's words and works, " that wherever they ſhould be, they might " have with them the ground of their faith." This writer does not ſay, that this was the perſecution, that aroſe about the time of the death of *Stephen*. He ſeems to ſpeak of a later, and more general perſecution and diſperſion, ſuch as may be well ſuppoſed to have been in *Judea*, near the war, in 66. When moſt, or all the Apoſtles, and many of the Jewiſh believers, removed, and were diſperſed into other countreys.

In the Paſchal Chronicle, a work compoſed in the ſeventh centurie, as formerly cited, it is intimated, that *(e)* St. *Matthew* publiſhed his Goſpel in *Paleſtine*, about fifteen Years after our Lord's aſcenſion, and ſoon after the Council at *Jeruſalem*, of which an account is given Acts xv.

And, to draw to a concluſion of this liſt of writers. *Theophylact*, in the eleventh centurie, ſays: " *Matthew* then *(f)* firſt wrote a

(e) See Vol. viii. p. 178.
(f) Vol. xi. p. 419. 420.

" Goſpel in the *Hebrew* language, for the " ſake of the *Hebrew* believers, eight years " after our Saviour's aſcenſion."

Euthymius in the begining of the twelfth centurie: " That *(g) Matthew*'s Goſpel was " the firſt, and writ in *Judea*, in *Hebrew*, " for the Jewiſh believers, eight years after " our Lord's aſcenſion."

Nicephorus Calliſti, in the fourteenth centurie, ſays: " *Matthew (h)* having preached " the ſaving word to the Jews, when he " was about to go abroad to the Gentils, " thought it beſt to write in his native lan- " guage an account of his preaching, to ſup- " ply the want of his preſence. Which he " did at about fifteen years after our Saviour's " aſcenſion."

Remarks. III. Who now of all theſe writers deſerves the greateſt regard? *Irenaeus*, I think, as being the moſt ancient. And with him agree *Epiphanius*, *Theodore* of *Mopſueſtia*, and the Author of the Imperfect Work, as it ſeems. Nor is he contradicted by *Euſebius* of *Ceſarea*, ſo far as I can *(i)* perceive. He ſays,

(g) P. 435. *(h)* P. 442.
(i) *See Vol. viii. p.* 177. . . 179.

ſays, " that when *Matthew* was about to " go to other people, he delivered his Goſ- " pel to the *Hebrews* in their own language." But he does not ſay in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie, nor any where elſe, when this Apoſtle left *Judea*. Some *(k)* may have underſtood him to mean about eight years after our Saviour's aſcenſion, and others about fifteen years after it, as *Nicephorus*, and perhaps the Paſchal Chronicle. But himſelf has not expreſſly mentioned the time. And he may have been undetermined in his mind about the time, when *Matthew* left *Judea*. Moreover, he has inſerted *(l)* in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie the paſſage of *Irenaeus* above quoted, upon which we inſiſt. And a late date of the Goſpels is agreeable to his own, and others obſervations, before taken notice of, that the Apoſtles of Chriſt did not write many books, and were not very forward to write, but as they were compelled by a kind of neceſſity.

There are divers learned moderns of good judgment in theſe matters, who pay a great regard to this teſtimonie of *Irenaeus*, parti-

(k) See Vol. viii. p. 176. *&c.*
(l) L. 5. *cap.* 8. *p.* 172. *C.*

cularly, *(m) Fabricius*, *(n) Mill*, *(o) S. Baſnage*, and before them *(p) Martin Chemnitius*.

Mill ſuppoſed it to be highly probable, that *(q) Irenaeus* had this account from *Papias*. *Le Clerc (r)* likewiſe ſeems to have thought, that *Irenaeus* found this in the five books of *Papias*. But that is only conjecture. *Euſebe* quoting *Papias* obſerves, that he ſaid, *Matthew* wrote in *Hebrew*. But he does not ſay, that *Papias* mentioned the time of writing his Goſpel. However, it was the opinion of *Irenaeus*. And it may be reckoned not improbable, that he had a tradition to that purpoſe, which he relied upon as right. For he ſpeaks of it without heſitation. It might

(m) De tempore, quando ſcripſerit, cui potius fidem habeamus, quam S. Irenaeo, temporibus illis proximo, qui tradit eum edidiſſe Evangelium, τῦ πέτρυ καὶ τῦ παύλυ ἐν ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. *Bib. Gr. l. 4. c. 5. T. 3. p. 126.*

(n) Prolegom. num. 61. *(o) A. 64. n. xii.*

(p) Examen Concil Trid. p. 16.

(q) Tamen Irenaeus l. 3. c. i. expreſſe dicit, ex auctoritate Papiae, nullus dubito, qui παράδοσιν hanc a Joanne Preſbytero, Apoſtolorum familiari, acceperat, Matthaeum Evangelium ſuum edidiſſe, *cum Petrus et Paulus evangelizarent Romae, et fundarent eccleſiam. Proleg. num. 61.*

(r) Vid. Diſſ. de iv. Evang. ſub init.

might be derived from ſeveral, one of whom was *Papias.*

Irenaeus ſays, that " *Matthew* publiſhed his Goſpel, when *Peter* and *Paul* were preaching at *Rome :* " that is, ſays *(s) Mill*, in the year 61. " For, adds he, I underſtand " him of the firſt time, that *Paul* was at " *Rome.*" But if *Irenaeus* ſays right, it muſt have been at the ſecond time that *Paul* was at *Rome.* For we have no reaſon to believe, that *Peter* was at all in that city, when *Paul* was ſent thither by *Feſtus.* But, very probably, *Peter* and *Paul* were there together afterwards, and ſuffered martyrdom there, about the ſame time. That is the ſeaſon, to which we ſhould be led for fixing the writing of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, if *Irenaeus* may be relied upon. Accordingly *Baſnage (t)* in his Annals ſpeaks of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel

(s) Atque hoc ipſo quidem anno LXI. prodiiſſe videtur Evangelium Matthaei. . . Ego quidem de priori adventu intelligendum Irenaeum omnino arbitror. *Ib. num.* 61. 62.

(t) Quo tempore Petrus Pauluſque Romae operam dabant evangelio, Matthaeus, ſi creditur Irenaeo, Evangelium exaravit ſuum. . . Annum tamen perinde atque locum, ubi a Matthaeo conditum eſt, in incerto eſſe, facile patimur. . . Nos nonniſi Nerone rerum domino editum fuiſſe, perſuaſum habemus, etſi de anno locove divinare non poſſumus. Nulla tamen

Goſpel at the year 64. And though, as he ſays, he does not know the year, nor the place, where St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel was publiſhed, yet he expreſſeth himſelf, as if he was inclined to think, it was not writ, till *Nero*'s reign was ſomewhat advanced, in the year 64. or 65. the time of that Emperour's perſecution of the Chriſtians.

Other learned men are for an earlier date. Whoſe opinions alſo, undoubtedly, ought to be taken notice of, and conſidered by us.

Cave thought, that *(u)* St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel was writ about the fifteenth year after our Saviour's aſcenſion, in the year 48. a ſhort time before the council of *Jeruſalem*, or ſoon after it.

Baronius

tamen ſe magis veri ſpecie commendat chronologia, quam illa Irenaei: quod nempe Paulo et Petro Romanos inſtituentibus, ſcribendo Matthaeus operam dederit: ut Eccleſiae aliquid monumenti eſſet, quo ob ortum ex perſecutione Neronis dolorem leniret, ſanctorumque Apoſtolorum eo fluctu oppreſſorum faciem in Evangelio videre ſibi videretur Eccleſia. *Baſn. Ann.* 64. *n. xii.*

(u) Scripſiſſe Evangelium ſuum viii. a Chriſti reſurrectione anno vulgo dicitur. Quod tamen ad annum a Chriſti aſſumtione 15. referunt auctor Chr. A. et Nicephorus. Et ſane eum ante annum a paſſione Chriſti 12. Apoſtolis Judaeae finibus egredi non licuit, vix ante ann. 15. chr. 48. finita ſynodo Hieroſolymitana, ad ſuam quiſque ſortem abierunt, adeo ut paullo ante Matthaeus Evangelium ſuum condidiſſe videtur. *H. L. in Matthaeo. p.* 13.

Baronius was of opinion, that *(x)* this Goſpel was publiſhed in the year 41. ſoon after that *Peter*, had begun to preach to Gentils at the houſe of *Cornelius* in *Ceſarea*.

Grotius (y) and *G. I. Voſſius (z)* were likewiſe of opinion, that St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel was writ about eight years after Chriſt's aſcenſion.

Tillemont argues, "That *(a)* St. *Matthew* wrote his Goſpel about three years after the crucifixion of Chriſt. For it muſt have been writ before the Apoſtles left *Judea*. The time of their going abroad, as he owns, is uncertain. But it muſt have been about the year 36. foraſmuch as it appears, that in the year 37. when *Paul* came to *Jeruſalem*, there were no other Apoſtles there, beſide *Peter*,

(x) Baron. Ann. 41. *nnm. ix. xvi.*

(y) Grot. Pr. ad Matth.

(z) Si quidem Matthaeus in Paleſtina ſcribebat, idque intra proximum a paſſione Chriſti octennium. *Voſſ. de Gen. J. C. cap.* 4. §. *ii.*

(a) Il ſemble meſme neceſſaire de dire, que S. Matthieu a écrit trois ans ſeulement après la mort de J. C. . . Le temps de cette diviſion des Apôtres eſt incertain. Il ſemble neanmoins, que ç'a été vers l'an 36. puiſqu'il paroiſt, qu'il n'y avoit aucun Apoſtre à Jeruſalem, lorſque S. Paul vint en 37. hors S. Pierre, et S. Jacque le mineur. *S. Matthieu. Mem. T. i.*

Peter, and *James* the Leſs." But that argument is of no value. For the Apoſtles might be all at *Jeruſalem*, or in it's neighborhood, though *Paul* ſaw none, beſide the two juſt mentioned.

Mr. *Jones* earneſtly contends, that *(b)* this Goſpel was writ about eight years after our Lord's aſcenſion, in the year 41. But I do not think it needful to take any farther notice of his arguments, than has been done *(c)* already.

Mr. *Wetſtein* has lately declared in favour of the ſame opinion. " And *(d)* hence, ſays he, " we diſcern the reaſon, why this Evange- " liſt has inſerted ſo many diſcourſes about " the

(b) New and full Method. &c. Vol. iii. ch. v. p. 59. . . 64.

(c) See Vol. viii. p. 176. . . 179.

(d) Magno conſenſu perhibent Patres, Matthaeum in gratiam credentium ex Judaeis in Palaeſtina Evangelium ſuum exſcripſiſſe, et quidem, ut multi addunt, Hieroſolymis, octavo poſt aſcenſionem Chriſti anno, qui Claudii Imperatoris primus fuit. Cur illorum teſtimonium in dubium vocetur, cauſam non video : quin iſta hypotheſi admiſſa, plurima non infeliciter exiſtimo explicari poſſe, quorum aliter ratio vix invenitur. Hinc enim intelligimus, cur Matthaeus primum in ordine Evangeliſtarum occupet locum, quia nimirum primus omnium ſcripſit : cur item tam multas de Judaeorum ſuperſtitionibus referat diſputationes, quibus apud alias nationes, vel templo jam everſo, vel paulo poſt evertendo, locus vix fuiſſet. *Wetſt. N. T. Tom. i. p.* 223.

" the Jewiſh ſuperſtitions: which could be " of little or no uſe to other people, and " among other nations, when the temple " was once deſtroyed, or was near being deſ- " troyed." But I am not able to diſcern any force in that way of reaſoning, becauſe I perceive not any ſuperfluities in this, or any of the Evangeliſts. Our Lord's reproofs of Jewiſh ſuperſtitions, his declarations of the ſuperiority of moral virtue, or righteouſneſſe and true holineſſe, above the righteouſneſſe of the Scribes and Phariſees, his cenſures of the pride and covetouſneſſe, falſe maxims, and hypocritical conduct of the ſame men, will be uſeful to all people, ſo long as the world ſtands. As our Lord was a Jew, and his miniſtrie was employed among thoſe people in *Judea*; it is no wonder, that in his diſcourſes, recorded by St. *Matthew*, whenever he wrote, there ſhould be frequent alluſions to their laws, cuſtoms, and worſhip. The like *(e)* are in the other two firſt Evangeliſts.

And

(e) When Mr. *Wetſtein* ſpeaks of *the many diſcourſes about Jewiſh ſuperſtitions*, which are in St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel: I imagine, he may particularly refer to Matt. xxiii. 1. . . 30. Nevertheleſs divers of thoſe things occur alſo in the Goſpels of St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*. See Mark xii. 38. . . 40.

Luke

And in St. *John*'s Goſpel, the laſt of the four, are as long diſcourſes with the cavilling Jews, as in any of the reſt.

I therefore readily aſſent to thoſe, who think, that this Goſpel was writ in the time of the Emperour *Nero*, not till about thirty years after our Saviour's aſcenſion. I am not able to aſſign the year, in which it was writ. But I am ſomewhat inclined to the year 63. 64. or 65. of the vulgar epoch. This is agreeable not only to the teſtimonie of *Irenaeus*, and ſome other ancients, but to the circumſtances of things. At the year 64. or thereabout, the goſpel had been propagated in many Gentil countreys, the times were troubleſome in *Judea*, and the war was coming on: ſeveral of the Apoſtles were dead, others of them, who ſurvived, were gone, or going abroad, and many of the Jewiſh believers were about to ſeek ſhelter elſewhere. Now was a proper time, to write a hiſtorie of Chriſt, and his miracles. Moreover in this Goſpel are recorded

Luke xi. 42. . . 52. and xx. 46. 47. And both *Mark* viii. 14. . . 21. and *Luke* xii. 1. 2. have recorded our Lord's injunctions, *to beware of the leaven of the Phariſees, and Sadducees, or Herodians*, as well as *Matthew* xvi. 6. . . 12. Not now to mention any other like things.

corded divers plain predictions of the miſeries and deſolations of *Jeruſalem*, and the overthrow of the temple, and the Jewiſh ſtate, beſide many other figurative intimations of the ſame things in many of our Lord's diſcourſes and parables. Which could not be well publiſhed to all the world in writing, till about this time. The ſuitableneſſe of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel to the ſtate of the Chriſtian Religion, and of the Jewiſh People, about the year 64. or 65. leads to that time. And however unwillingly, from private apprehenſions and prejudices, we may admit the thought of protracting ſo long the writing the hiſtorie of our Lord's miniſtrie; the circumſtances of things will conſtrain us to acquieſce in this ſeaſon, as the moſt likely.

Marks of Time in this Goſpel.

IV. This leads me now to obſerve ſome characters of time in the Goſpel itſelf.

It is well known, and allowed by all, that *(f)* for a while our Lord's diſciples labored under Jewiſh prejudices: and that they did not fully underſtand all his diſcourſes,

(f) There are many proofs of this in the Goſpels. See particularly John xvi. 7. . . 14. and likewiſe the hiſtorie in the Acts. ch. x.

courſes, at the time when they were ſpoken. They did not, they could not, clearly diſcern the comprehenſive deſign of the evangelical diſpenſation, till after *Peter* had been at the houſe of *Cornelius*, and there received into the Church Gentil converts, without circumciſion: nor till after the goſpel had been preached abroad in foreign countreys by *Paul*, and other Apoſtles, and miniſters. Let us therefore now obſerve the book itſelf of St. *Matthew*, and ſee what knowledge he appears to have had of the ſcheme of the goſpel.

1. His account of the commiſſion, which our Lord gave to the twelve Apoſtles is in ch. xxviii. 19. *Go ye therefore into all the world, and teach all nations.* *Matthew* did not then think, that the Apoſtles of Jeſus were to teach Jews only, but that they were required to teach all people, and all nations in general.

2. I ſuppoſe, that he fully underſtood our Lord's doctrine, when he recorded that ſummarie account of it, which is in the fifth, ſixth, and ſeventh chapters of his Goſpel. The beatitudes, at the begining, are a proof of it. And at the concluſion, they who *heard and did thoſe ſayings*, are compared to

to *a man that built his houſe upon a rock:* though there had been nothing ſaid to enforce the rituals of the Moſaic law.

3. And that he well underſtood the ſpirituality, and the freedom of the goſpel, appears from what he has recorded ch. xv. 10. . . 20.

4. His clear diſcernment of the deſign of the goſpel-diſpenſation appears even in his account of our Saviour's nativity, particularly, in what he ſays ch. i. 21. of the meſſage of the angel to *Joſeph*. *And thou ſhalt call his name Jeſus. For he ſhall ſave his people from their ſins.*

5. If he had not known, that our Saviour was deſigned to be, or was already become a bleſſing to Gentils, he would ſcarcely have thought of inſerting the hiſtorie of the Magians coming from the Eaſt to *Jeruſalem*, to inquire after the birth of the King of the Jews. Chap. ii.

6. It is alſo very likely, that he underſtood thoſe words of *John* the Baptiſt, recorded by him ch. iii. 9. *God is able of theſe ſtones to raiſe up children to Abraham.*

7. St. *Matthew*'s knowledge of the calling of the Gentils, and the rejection of the Jews, may be concluded from many things re-

corded by him. In the hiſtorie of our Lord's healing the Centurion's ſervant at *Capernaum* he inſerts our Lord's commendation of his faith, and that declaration: *Many ſhall come from the Eaſt and the Weſt, and ſit down with Abraham, and Iſaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom ſhall be caſt out.* ch. viii. 10 . . 12.

8. The admiſſion of the Gentils to equal privileges with the Jews muſt be intimated in the parable of the laborers hired into the vineyard at ſeveral hours of the day. ch. xx. 1 . . 16.

9. The calling and acceptance of the Gentils, and the rejection of the Jewiſh People, and even their overthrow, are plainly declared in the parable of the vineyard, let out to huſbandmen, and the diſcourſe, which follows. xxi. 33 . . 46. The ſame things are intimated in the parable of the King that made a wedding-feaſt for his ſon, which is at the begining of the next chapter. xxii. 1 . . 14.

10. I might likewiſe take notice of the hiſtorie of our Lord's curing the daughter of the woman of *Canaan*. ch. xv. 21 . . 28.

11. It is alſo very likely, that St. *Mat-*

thew

thew had ſome good knowledge, and a diſtinct apprehenſion of the extent of our Lord's kingdom, and the progreſſe of his doctrine, when he recorded thoſe parables in the thirteenth chapter of his Goſpel: where our Lord has compared the kingdom of heaven, or the preaching his goſpel, to a grain of muſtard-ſeed, the leſt of all ſeeds, but becomes a tree: to leaven, by which a large lump is leavened: to a net, that was caſt into the ſea, and gathered of every kind. And, explaining the parable of the tares, our Lord ſays, ver. 37, 38. *He that ſoweth the good ſeed is the Son of Man. The field is the world.* And what follows.

12. It is probable, that this Evangeliſt had ſome knowledge of the goſpel having been preached out of Judea, when he put down that declaration of our Lord concerning the woman, that poured the rich ointment upon his head: *Whereſoever the goſpel ſhall be preached in the whole world, there ſhall this alſo, that this woman has done, be told for a memorial of her.* ch. xxvi. 13.

13. In his account of the inſtitution of the euchariſt. ch. xxvi. 28. our Lord ſays: *This is my blood of the New Teſtament, which is ſhed for many*, that is, for all men, *for the*

remiſſion of their ſins. And in ch. xx. 28. our Lord ſays: *The ſon of man came . . . to give his life a ranſom for many.*

14. There is alſo an expreſſion uſed by him once or twice, intimating, that it was ſome conſiderable ſpace, ſince the time of the event and his writing about it. ch. xxviii. 8. *Wherefore that field was called the field of bloud to this day.* Having related the affair of the ſoldiers, and the directions given to them by the Jewiſh Council to ſay, that *his diſciples came by night, and ſtole him away*, he adds: *And this ſaying is commonly reported among the Jews untill this day.* ver. 15. Such an expreſſion does not denote any certain period. But one would think, that, in this caſe, thereby muſt be intended a conſiderable ſpace of time, more than eight, or ten, or fifteeen years.

15. I formerly *(g)* ſhewed divers advantages of the late publication of the Goſpels. The life of Jeſus could not be forgotten in thirty, or forty years. His life and death were very public, as well as very extraordinarie. His reſurrection and aſcenſion were moſt publicly atteſted by his Apoſtles, and others, as we know from the book of the Acts.

(g) See Vol. viii. p. 124. . . 137.

Acts. And from that time forward there were many, who were continually ſpeaking of the things ſaid and done by him, and of the evidences of his reſurrection and exaltation. They were ſoon known to multitudes of people, ſmall and great, and men of all ranks and characters. As St. *Paul* ſays to *Feſtus*, in a very great aſſemblie. Acts xxvi. 36. *For the King knoweth of theſe things, before whom alſo I ſpeak freely. For I am perſuaded, that none of theſe things are hidden from him. For this thing was not done in a corner.* And was it not the cry at *Theſſalonica?* Acts xvii. 6. *Theſe that have turned the world upſide down, are come hither alſo.* The account of St. *Paul*'s manner of living at *Rome*, about the years 61. and 62. is, that *he dwelled two whole years in his own hired houſe, and received all that came in unto him, . . . teaching thoſe things, which concern the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Acts xxviii. 30. 31. Whilſt there were men, who at the hazard of their lives taught, and others that embraced, the things concerning the Lord Jeſus, they could not be forgotten. And if about thirty years after our Lord's aſcenſion, his hiſtorie was writ by eye-witneſſes, or their companions, it was ſoon enough. Yea, it was the fitteſt time of

all. At the year ſixty, of our Lord's nativity, according to the vulgar aera, and later, there certainly were enough ſuch perſons, as thoſe juſt mentioned, ſtill living, to record his words and works, and more, who were willing, and deſirous to read written hiſtories of him, than before: and alſo more to tranſcribe and copy out thoſe hiſtories for their own uſe, and for the uſe and benefit of others, than in any preceding time.

It's original Language.

V. It remains, that we conſider, in what language this Goſpel was writ: becauſe many of the ancients, whoſe teſtimonies have been lately recited, though they allow the other Goſpels to have been writ in *Greek*, have delivered it as their opinion, that this Goſpel was writ in *Hebrew*.

Of this I have already ſpoken ſeveral times, particularly, in the chapter of *(h) Papias*, and in the chapter of *(i) Origen*, and *(k)* of *Euſebius* of *Ceſarea*: where alſo the opinions of divers learned moderns were alleged, who think, it was writ in *Greek*. To them I now add *(l) Le Clerc*, who has an argument upon this head, proper to be conſulted by thoſe

(h) Vol. i. p. 243. 244.
(i) Vol. iii. p. 403. . . 408.
(k) Vol. viii. p. 184. . . 189.
(l) Diſſ. iii. De iv. Evangeliis.

thoſe who have leiſure, but too long to be inſerted here: and his learned ſucceſſor Mr. *Wetſtein*, who ſays: "Here *(m)* we are of "opinion, that the Fathers do not ſo properly "bear teſtimonie, as deliver their own con-"jecture: which needs not to be admitted, "if it be not ſupported by good reaſons, or "may be refuted by probable arguments. "Suppoſing, and taking it for granted, that "*Matthew* wrote for the Jews in *Judea*, "they concluded, that he wrote in *Hebrew*. "But there is no weight in that reaſon. The "*Greek* language was at that time much uſed "throughout the whole Roman Empire, "and particularly in *Judea*. *Papias*, who firſt

(m) Neque tam facile aſſentimur ſententiae eorundem Patrum ſtatuentium, Matthaeum ſcripſiſſe Hebraice, hoc eſt, Syriace, ſive Chaldaice, quâ linguâ tunc temporis Judaei in Palaeſtina utebantur. . . Exiſtimamus enim Patres hic jam non teſtimonium dicere, ſed conjecturam ſuam in medium proferre, non admittendam, ſi aut idoneis rationibus non ſit fulta, aut veroſimilibus argumentis refutari poſſit. Quod enim putant neceſſe fuiſſe ut Hebraeis ſcribens Hebraice ſcriberet, verum non eſt: cum conſtet eo tempore linguam Graecam per totum Imperium Romanum, et in Judaea praeſertim, in uſu fuiſſe. . . Videntur ergo vetutiſſimi Patres, et inter eos Papias, homo ſimplex et credulus, re non explorata, inani Nazaraeorum jactantiae fidem habuiſſe. . . Nullum ſane in noſtro Matthaeo reperitur indicium, unde colligi poſſit, ex alia in aliam linguam fuiſſe converſam. Plurima vero aliud ſuadent. *Wetſten. N. T. Tom. i. p.* 224.

" advanced this opinion, was a weak and cre-
" dulous man. Nor are there in our *Greek*
" Goſpel any marks of it's being a tranſlation
" from another language."

Mr. *Jones (n)* has a long argument, well deſerving to be read, ſhewing, that this Goſpel was originally writ in *Greek*.

Mr. *Baſnage (o)* is of the ſame ſide, and has argued exceeding well for it. I ſhould tranſcribe him, if I had room. As I have not, I refer to him.

Says (*) Dr. *Jortin* : " In the time of Chriſt and his Apoſtles the Greek was really the univerſal language. The New Teſtament is a proof of it, if proof were wanting. And this is one reaſon amongſt many others, why St. *Matthew* probably wrote his Goſpel in *Greek*. See *Wetſtein*'s N. T. p. 224. St. Matthew ch. v. 47. 48. ſays: Ὅτι τελῶναι οὕτω ποιοῦσιν. Ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι . . that is, be not τελῶναι, but τέλειοι. Videtur autem Matthaeus vocem τέλειοι hic adhibuiſſe, ut τελώναις opponeret. Wetſtein.

(n) *See his Vindication of the former part of St. Matthew's Goſpel ch.* 17. . . 19. *p.* 180. . . 186.

(o) *Ann.* 64. *n. xiii.*

(*) *See his Diſcourſes concerning the Chriſtian Religion. p.* 176. *note (o) the third edition.*

Wetſtein. Add to this, that τελώνης and τέλειος are both derived from the ſame word, τέλος. So again, ch. vi. 16. we find an antitheſis in the words, ἀφανίζουσι τὰ πρόσωπα, ὅπως φάνωσι. Eleganter dicitur: *Tegunt faciem, ut appareant, &c.* Wetſtein.

And many others of the ſame ſentiment might be mentioned, who are men of great learning and good judgement.

I ſhall now propoſe ſome obſervations relating to this point.

1. If St. *Matthew* did not write till about thirty years after our Lord's aſcenſion, we muſt be led to think, he would uſe the *Greek* language. That he did not write ſooner, I ſuppoſe to have been ſhewn to be very probable. If indeed there were good reaſons to think, his Goſpel was writ within the ſpace of eight years after Chriſt's aſcenſion, we might well conclude, that he wrote in *Hebrew*. But, to me it ſeems, that we may be fully ſatisfied, that *Matthew* did not write within that ſpace, nor ſo ſoon as fifteen years after our Lord's aſcenſion, nor till ſome good while afterwards. St. *James*, reſiding at *Jeruſalem*, writes an epiſtle about the year of Chriſt 60. as is ſuppoſed. It is addreſſed *to the twelve tribes ſcattered abroad.*

And

And he writes in *Greek*, as is allowed. Why, then, ſhould not St. *Matthew* uſe the ſame language?

2. There was very early a *Greek* Goſpel of St. *Matthew*. It is quoted, or referred to by *Clement* of *Rome*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Juſtin Martyr*, not now to mention any others: none of whom intimate, that they made uſe of a tranſlation.

3. Though many of the ancients ſay, that St. *Matthew* wrote in *Hebrew*, they ſeem not to have fully believed it. For they have ſhewn very little regard to the *Hebrew* edition of it. This has been particularly ſhewn in the chapters of *(p) Origen*, *(q) Euſebius* of *Ceſarea*, and *(r) Jerome*, the moſt likely of any of the ancients to make uſe of that edition, if they had been perſuaded, that it was authentic and original.

4. There are not in our *Greek* Goſpel of St. *Matthew* any marks of a tranſlation. So ſaid Mr. *Wetſtein* in the paſſage juſt tranſcribed. And this obſervation was before made by us in the chapter of *(s) Papias*.

5. There

(p) Vol. iii. p. 403. . . 408.
(q) Vol. viii. p. 185. . . 189.
(r) Voi. x. p. 170. . . 172.
(s) Vol. i. p. 244.

5. There is no where any probable account, who tranſlated this Goſpel into *Greek*. No particular tranſlator was mentioned by *Papias*, as may be concluded from the accounts given of his books by *Euſebe*. Nor is any tranſlator of this Goſpel named by *Irenaeus*, *Euſebe*, or any of the writers of the firſt three centuries, that are come down to us. Nor is there any reaſon to think, that he was named in any other; foraſmuch as no notice is taken of him by *Euſebe*, or *Jerome*, who ſaw many writings of ancients now loſt, both catholics and heretics. *Jerome* having ſaid, that *Matthew* wrote in *Hebrew*, preſently adds: "Who *(t)* afterwards tranſlated him into *Greek*, is uncertain." And all the accounts of a tranſlator, ſince given, are too late to be credited, and are likewiſe very improbable. In the Synopſis aſcribed to *Athanaſius*, but not writ till long after his time, it is ſaid, "That *(u) Matthew*'s Goſpel was tranſlated into *Greek* by *James*, the firſt Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*." Which is very improbable. It would be more reaſonable to imagine, that he tranſlated it out of *Greek* into *Hebrew*. But as

(t) Vol. x. p. 89.
(u) Vol. viii. p. 249.

as that is not ſaid by the ancients, ſo neither have we reaſon to ſay it. Moreover, the ſame reaſons, as one may think, which would induce *James* to make a *Greek* tranſlation, ſhould have induced *Matthew* to write in *Greek.* Nevertheleſs Dr. *Mill (x)* has pitched upon that perſon for the tranſlator, and formed an argument thereupon. Which only ſerves to ſhew, that there is nothing, for which ſomething may not be ſaid by thoſe, who indulge themſelves in ſuppoſitions, without ground. *Theophylact* informs us, that *(y)* in his time it was ſaid, that *John* tranſlated this Goſpel into *Greek.* But it was only a common report. And indeed it could be no more. However, out of a regard to ſuch reports and teſtimonies, Mr.

(x) Quis in Graecum transfuderit, incertum eſt. Papias de hoc nihil ab Ariſtione aut Joanne preſbytero accepit, aut tradidit. Auctor Synopſeos S. Scripturae Jacobo fratri Domini diſerte adſcribit hanc verſionem. Theophylactus, ex fama duntaxat, Joanni Evangeliſtae. Ego ad priorem illam ſententiam, ſeu magis veriſimilem, accedo. Satis enim probabile eſt, Evangelium in Hebraeorum uſum linguâ ipſorum patriâ primum exaratum, ab ipſorum Epiſcopo primario Jacobo, Epiſcopo Hieroſolymitano, in ſermonem Graecum, per provincias, in quas diſperſi erant ex gente iſta plurimi, Judaeis pariter ac aliis in uſu familiari, tranſlatum fuiſſe, &c. *Proleg. num.* 66.

(y) Μετέφρασε δὲ τοῦτο ἰωάννης ἀπὸ τῆς ἑβραΐδος γλώττης εἰς τὴν ἑλληνίδα, ὡς λέγουσι. *Theoph. Pr. in Matth. p.* 2. *D.*

Mr. *Lampe (z)* has very properly reckoned a tranſlation of this Goſpel among the works falſly aſcribed to St. *John*.

6. Once more, I apprehend, we may diſcern the origin of this opinion, that St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel was writ in *Hebrew*. There was ſoon made a tranſlation of his *Greek* Goſpel into *Hebrew*. We have ſeen proofs, that *(a)* in very early days of Chriſtianity there was a *Hebrew* Goſpel. And many, not examining it particularly, nor indeed being able to do it, for want of underſtanding the language, imagined, that it was firſt writ in *Hebrew*. *Jerome* expreſſly tells us, that *(b)* by many in his time the Goſpel according to the *Hebrews* was reckoned the true and authentic Goſpel of *Matthew*.

To

(z) Matthaei Evangelium Graece a Joanne Evangeliſta verſum eſſe, refert Eutychius Tom. i. Annalium p. 328. et Nicetas praefatione ad Catenam in Matthaeum. *Lampe Prolegom. in Joan. l. i. cap. 7. num.* 31.

(a) See ch. xiv. Vol. i. p. 320. 321.

(b) In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae, quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo ſermone tranſtulimus, et quod vocatur a pleriſque Matthaei authenticum. *Hier. in Matth. cap. xii. T.* 4. *P. i. p.* 47.

In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos . . . quo utuntur uſque hodie Nazareni, ſecundum Apoſtolos, ſive ut plerique juxta Matthaeum. *Adv. Pelag. l.* 3. *ſub in T.* 4. *p.* 533.

To this *Hebrew* tranſlation of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, poſſibly, are owing divers things ſaid by the ancients: as that *Matthew* publiſhed his Goſpel at *Jeruſalem*, or in *Judea*, for the Jewiſh believers, and at their requeſt, before he went abroad to other people. I ſay, I do ſuſpect the truth of theſe, and ſome other like things, ſaid of St. *Matthew*, and his Goſpel. All which may have had their riſe from the *Hebrew* edition of his Goſpel, which they imagined to be the original. For I think, that St. *Matthew*'s, and all the other Goſpels were writ, and intended, for believers of all nations. His Goſpel was writ for the Jews, but not for them only, but for Gentils alſo: as manifeſtly appears from the Goſpel itſelf, or the things contained in it.

I am alſo ready to ſay, with *(c)* Mr. *Baſnage*, that I do not know where it was publiſhed, whether in *Judea*, or ſomewhere elſe. But as I think, the Nazaren Goſpel to be St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel tranſlated from *Greek*, with *(d)* the addition of ſome other things,

(c) Annum tamen perinde atque locum, ubi a Matthaeo conditum eſt, in incerto eſſe, faciles patimur. *Ann.* 64. *nnm. xii.*

(d) Diſtinguendum enim inter hoc Evangelium, quale initio

things, taken from the other Goſpels, and from tradition: So I reckon, that the Goſpel of *Matthew*, writ in *Greek*, was the Goſpel, which firſt came into their hands, and which they gladly received, and made uſe of. I ſay again, the notion of St. *Matthew*'s writing in *Hebrew*, probably, had it's riſe from the *Hebrew* edition of his Goſpel. For allowing that date of his Goſpel, which to me appears moſt probable, I cannot conceive the reaſon, why *Matthew* ſhould write in *Hebrew* any more than any of the other Evangeliſts. For it may be reckoned highly probable, or even certain, that he underſtood *Greek*, before he was called by Chriſt to be an Apoſtle. Whilſt a Publican, he would have frequent occaſions both to write and ſpeak *Greek*. And could not diſcharge his office, without underſtanding that language.

This *Hebrew* Goſpel may likewiſe have been the cauſe, why ſo many ancient Chriſtian writers ſay, that *Matthew* wrote firſt. This

initio fuit, et illud, quale paullatim fiebat, Nazaraeis varia addentibus. . . Primitus nihil habuit, niſi quod in Graeco nunc legimus. . . Porro Nazaraei pluſcula ſuis locis interſeruerunt, quae ab Apoſtolis, vel Apoſtolicis viris, fando acciſſent, *G. J. Voſſ. De Geneal. J. C. cap. ii. num. i.*

This may be true. But I do not think, it was ſaid upon the ground of any certain knowledge, or good information. I apprehend it not to be eaſie to ſay, which Goſpel was firſt writ. For all the firſt three Goſpels were writ about the ſame time. And St. *Luke*'s, for any thing that I know, may have been writ firſt. Which *(e)* was the opinion of Mr. *Baſnage*.

(e) Ann. 60. *num.* 31.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Time, when the Apoſtles left Judea, to go and preach the Goſpel in other Countreys.

AS many ancient Chriſtian writers, whom we have lately quoted, ſay, that St. *Matthew*, having preached ſome while in *Judea*, was deſired by the believers there, to leave with them in writing, before he went away, a hiſtorie of what he had taught by word of mouth: this may not be an improper place to inquire, how long it was after the aſcenſion of Jeſus, before *Matthew*, and the other Apoſtles, left *Judea*, to go abroad into foreign countreys.

And *firſt* of all, we will obſerve ſome remarkable paſſages of ancient writers, relating to this matter. And then, *ſecondly*, we

will conſider what light the book of the Acts may afford upon this ſubject.

Clement of *Alexandria*, about 194. quotes from a work, entitled the Preaching of *Peter*, this paſſage: "Therefore *(a) Peter* ſays, "that the Lord ſaid to the Apoſtles: If any "Iſraelite will repent, and believe in God "through my name, his ſins ſhall be for-"given. After twelve years go ye out into "the world, that none may ſay: We have "not heard."

The next paſſage is that of *Apollonius*, undoubtedly, in part contemporarie with *Clement*, and placed by *Cave* at the year 192. by me at 211. as near the time of his writing againſt the *Montaniſts*. "Moreover, "ſays (*b*) *Euſebe*, he relates as from tradition, "that our Saviour commanded his Apoſtles, "not to depart from *Jeruſalem* for the ſpace "of twelve years." Which paſſage has been already cited in this (*c*) work.

By

(a) Διὰ τοῦτό φησιν ὁ πέτρος, εἰρηκέναι τὸν κύριον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις· Ἐὰν μὲν οὖν τὶς θελήσῃ τῶ ἰσραὴλ μετανοῆσαι [forte μετανοήσας] διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν θεὸν, ἀφεθήσονται αὐτῷ ἁμαρτίαι. Μετὰ δώδεκα ἔτη ἐξέλθετε εἰς κόσμον, μή τις εἴπῃ· Οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν. *Clem. Str. l.* 6. *p.* 636. *Conf. Cav. H. L. T. i.* . 5. *et Grabe Spic. T. i. p.* 67.

(b) H. E. l. 5. *cap.* 18. *p.* 136.

(c) Ch. xxxi. Vol. iii. p. 16.

By theſe two paſſages *Cave* was induced to think, that *(d)* for twelve years after Chriſt's aſcenſion the Apoſtles did not depart from the neighborhood of *Jeruſalem.* Suppoſing our Saviour to have been crucified, and to have aſcended to heaven in the year 29. of the vulgar aera, which was a common opinion of the ancients, theſe twelve years ended in the year 41. Suppoſing thoſe great events to have happened in the year 33. which is a common opinion of learned moderns, thoſe twelve years would reach to the year 45.

Beſide thoſe two paſſages alleged by *Cave*, and other learned men, I ſhall take notice of ſome others alſo.

Origen ſays in general, "That (*e*) when the Jews did not receive the word, the Apoſtles went to the Gentils.

Chryſoſtom in a homilie upon Acts xi. 19. and what follows, ſpeaks to this purpoſe. "They heard, that *Samaria* had received "the word, and they ſent *Peter* and *John.* "They heard what had happened at *Anti-*

(d) Hiſt. Lit. T. i. p. 5. *et* 13.

(e) .. μὴ παραδεξαμένων ἰουδαίων τὸν λόγον, ἀπεληλύθεσαν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη. *In Matth. T. i. p.* 225. *E. Huet.*

" *och*, and they ſent *Barnabas*. For *(f)* that " was at a great diſtance. And it was not " fit, that the Apoſtles ſhould go ſo far as " yet, leaſt they ſhould have been eſteemed " deſerters, and thought to have fled from " their own people. But it then became ne- " ceſſarie for them to ſeparate, [or go from " thence] when the Jews ſhewed themſelves " to be incurable."

In the Paſchal Chronicle are theſe expreſ- ſions, ſpeaking of *Paul*. " Afterwards *(g)* " he coming to *Jeruſalem* with *Barnabas*, " and finding there *Peter*, and the reſt of the " Apoſtles, with *James* the Lord's brother, " the Apoſtles ſend an epiſtle to *Antioch* in " *Syria*, eſtabliſhing their church. And *Paul* " and *Barnabas* carry the epiſtle to *Antioch*, " as

(f) Πολύ γὰρ τὸ διάσημα, καὶ ἐκ ἔδει τῆς ἀποσόλης τέως χωρισθῆναι ἐκεῖθεν, ἵνα μὴ νομισθῶσιν εἶναί φυγάδες, καὶ τὰς αὐτῶν πεφευγέναι· τότε ἀναγκάιως χωρίζονται, ὅτε λοιπὸν ἀνίατα ἔχειν ἐδόκει τὰ κατ' αὐτές. *In Act. hom.* 25. *Tom.* 9. *p.* 202. 203.

(g) Μετέπειτα ἐλθὼν εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα μετὰ βαρνάβα, καὶ ἐυρὼν πέτρου καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς ἀποσόλης ἅμα ἰακώβῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ τὰ κυρίε, γράφουσιν ἐπισολὴν ὁι ἀποσόλοι εἰς ἀντιόχειαν τῆς συρίας, θεμελιῶντες τὴν αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ διακονῆσι τὴν ἐπισολὴν εἰς ἀντιόχειαν αὐτὸς παῦλος καὶ βαρνάβας, ὡς δηλῶσιν αἱ πράξεις. Ἐκ τέτε δείκνυται, ὅτι καὶ τὰς καθολικὰς αὐτῶν οἱ ἀπόσολοι τότε γράφσιν, πρὸ τῆς διασπορᾶς αὐτῶν. *Chr. Paſch. p.* 233. *B. C.*

" as the Acts ſhew. By this it appears, that " the Apoſtles then wrote their catholic epi- " ſtles, before their diſperſion."

Such are the paſſages of ancient writers, which muſt be reckoned to be of ſome weight.

Let us now obſerve the hiſtorie in the Acts. And it ſeems to me, there is reaſon to conclude, that the Apoſtles ſtaid in *Judea*, till after the Council at *Jeruſalem*, of which an account is given in the xv. chapter of that book. For St. *Luke* does continually ſpeak of the Apoſtles, as being at *Jeruſalem*, or near it. Acts viii. 1. *And at that time, there was a great perſecution againſt the church, which was at Jeruſalem. And they were all ſcattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the Apoſtles.* One of thoſe perſons, who then left *Jeruſalem*, was *Philip*, the Deacon and Evangeliſt: who went to *Samaria*, and preached Chriſt unto them, and with good effect. Whereupon at ver. 14. *Now when the Apoſtles, which were at Jeruſalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they ſent unto them Peter and John.* This needs no Comment. Here is proof, that when the reſt of the diſciples were ſcattered abroad, *Peter* and *John*,

and the other Apoſtles, were ſtill at *Jeruſalem.*

In Acts ix. 26. . . 30. is St. *Luke*'s account of *Paul*'s coming to *Jeruſalem*, after his converſion. Where he ſays, that *the diſciples were afraid of him. . . . . But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the Apoſtles.* St. *Paul* ſpeaking of the ſame journey, Gal. i. 18. 19. ſays: *Then after three years I went up to Jeruſalem, to ſee Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the Apoſtles ſaw I none, ſave James the Lord's brother.* Here we find, that at this time, three years after his converſion, *Paul* ſaw two Apoſtles only, *Peter* and *James.* But St. *Luke*'s words, as ſeems to me, imply, that all the Apoſtles were then at *Jeruſalem*, though *Paul* ſaw two only, the reſt for ſome reaſons declining to ſhew themſelves in perſon to him. Dr. *Doddridge* has this note upon ch. ix. 27. "*Paul* himſelf tells us, that upon his go-
"ing up to *Jeruſalem*, he ſaw no other
"Apoſtles, but *Peter* and *James.* Gal. i. 19.
"*Beza* well obſerves, we are quite uncertain,
"on what occaſion, the reſt were then ab-
"ſent from *Jeruſalem.* Had they been
"there, though *Paul* ſtaid but about a
"fortnight, he would no doubt have ſeen
"them."

"them." Nevertheleſs the ſolution of this difficulty appears to me very eaſie. The Apoſtles were now all at *Jeruſalem*, or near it. But they lived privatly, becauſe it was a time of perſecution. *The great perſecution againſt the church*, which began with the death of *Stephen*, was not yet over. The Apoſtles therefore could not appear abroad without danger. And it was ſufficient, that they ſpoke to *Paul*, and received him, by *Peter* and *James*. Which I take to be the true import of St. *Luke*'s expreſſion. *But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the Apoſtles.*

After *Peter* had been at the houſe of *Cornelius*, it is ſaid. Acts xi. 1. *And the Apoſtles and brethren that were in Judea, heard, that the Gentils alſo had received the word.* Another proof, that all the Apoſtles, or moſt of them, were ſtill at *Jeruſalem*. But I do not ſuppoſe, that the Apoſtles, like many other of the Jewiſh believers, were offended at what *Peter* had done. Or, if they were at firſt ſomewhat offended, they were ſoon, and eaſily ſatisfied, and were very willing to teſtify their approbation of *Peter*'s conduct.

From the 12. chapter of the Acts we know, that *James* ſon of *Zebedee*, and brother

of *John*, and *Peter*, were at *Jeruſalem*, in the year 44. or thereabout, near the end of the reign of *Herod Agrippa*: the former of whom was beheaded, and the other impriſoned. And at ver. 17. is mention made of another *James*, ſuppoſed to be the Lord's brother, and always reſident at *Jeruſalem*.

From the account of the Council of *Jeruſalem*, and of the occaſion of it, all the Apoſtles appear to have been then in *Judea*, and at *Jeruſalem*, or in its neighborhood. Acts xv. *When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no ſmall diſſenſion and diſputation with them, they determined, that Paul, and Barnabas, and certain other of them, ſhould go up to Jeruſalem, unto the Apoſtles and Elders about this queſtion.* ver. 4. *And when they were come to Jeruſalem, they were received of the church, and* or even *the Apoſtles and Elders.* . . . . ver. 6. *And the Apoſtles and Elders came together*, that is, met in Council, *for to conſider of this matter.* . . ver. 22. *Then pleaſed it the Apoſtles, and Elders, with the whole church, to ſend choſen men of their own companie, to Antioch.* . . ver. 23. *And they wrote letters by them after this manner: The Apoſtles, and Elders, and Brethren ſend greeting.* . . ver. 33. *And after they had tarried there a ſpace*, that is, at *Antioch*,

tioch, they were let go in peace from the brethren unto the Apoſtles.

In all theſe places *the Apoſtles* muſt intend all the Apoſtles, or the Apoſtles in general. For how can the expreſſion be underſtood otherwiſe?

If it ſhould be ſaid, that the Apoſtles might be at the Council at *Jeruſalem*, though ſeveral of them had been before in other countreys: I think, that would be ſaid without ground and reaſon. It does not appear, that the Apoſtles were ſent to, invited, or called in from abroad, to attend this Council. But the Chriſtians at *Antioch* ſuppoſed, or rather knew, that the Apoſtles were at *Jeruſalem*, and therefore directly ſent thither to them.

Indeed none of the Apoſtles are expreſsly named as ſpeakers in the debates of the Council, beſide *Peter* and *James*. But all the reſt may have been there. So upon divers other occaſions in the Goſpels, and at the begining of the Acts, *Peter* only ſpake, though all the reſt were preſent. In Gal. ii. 8. 9. 10. St. *Paul* giving an account of a journey to *Jeruſalem*, ſuppoſed to be the ſame with this to the Council, ſpeaks of conferences, which he had with three, namely *James*, *Cephas*, and

and *John*, who *ſeemed to be pillars*. Here * is one more mentioned as preſent at *Jeruſalem*, beſide the two before taken notice of. And there muſt have been others beſide theſe three, who *ſeemed to be pillars*, or were the moſt eminent.

The firſt time, that we meet with the mention of any one of the twelve, as being out of *Judea*, is that in Gal. ii. 11. after this Council, as is generally allowed, when *Peter* was at *Antioch*. It is very obſervable, Acts xi. 19.... 22. when *tidings came to the ears of the church at Jeruſalem*, that many Gentils had been converted at *Antioch* by ſome of thoſe who were ſcattered abroad by the perſecution, *they ſent forth Barnabas, that he ſhould go as far as Antioch*. None of the Apoſtles went, not ſo much as one, to accompany him. And afterwards ch. xiii 1... 3. in the account of the extraordinarie miſſion of *Paul* and *Barnabas* from *Antioch* to *Cyprus*, and other parts, there is no mention made of any Apoſtle, as preſent at *Antioch*. And it is plain, there was not one there.

All

* *Theodoret* has a like argument: Ἐξ ὧν ῥάδιον κατιδεῖν. ὡς ὑδέτερω καταλελόιπει τὴν ἰουδαίαν ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος ἰωάννης. *Theodr. Pr. in ep. ad Eph. Tom.* 3. *p.* 290.

All theſe conſiderations induce me to think, that none of the twelve Apoſtles left *Judea* to teach either Jews or Gentils in other Countreys, untill after this Council.

Having now, as I apprehend, ſhewn this to be very probable, I ſhall mention ſome remarks. Whereby there may be an opportunity for anſwering objections, though ſeveral have been already obviated.

1. There was a fitneſſe in it. It was very proper, and even expedient, that the Apoſtles ſhould ſtay a good while in *Judea*, to aſſert and confirm the truth of Chriſt's reſurrection by teaching, and by miraculous works, and do their utmoſt to bring the Jewiſh People to faith in Jeſus as the Chriſt.

2. As this was fit, it is likely, that they had received ſome command from Chriſt himſelf, or ſome direction from the Holy Ghoſt, to ſtay thus long in *Judea*.

3. There were conſiderations, that would incline them to it, and induce them to do what was fit to be done, and was agreeable to the mind of Chriſt. One was the difficulty of preaching the goſpel in foreign countreys. This would induce them to ſtay in *Judea*, till the circumſtances of things facilitated their farther progreſſe, or called them to

to it. Another thing was their affection for the Jewiſh People, their countrey-men, eſpecially thoſe of *Judea*, with whom they had been brought up, and among whom they dwelt, together with a perſuaſion of the great value of the bleſſing of the goſpel. This laſt conſideration, I apprehend, would induce them to labor in *Judea*, with earneſt deſires, and ſome hopes, of bringing all, or however, many, to faith in Jeſus. This influenced *Paul* alſo to a great degree, and for a good while. Nor was he without hopes of perſuading his brethren and countrey-men to what appeared to himſelf very certain and evident. So he ſays in his ſpeech to the people at *Jeruſalem*. Acts xxii. 17. . . 20. He aſſures them, that whilſt he was worſhiping at *Jeruſalem*, in the temple, he had a tranſe or extaſie: that he there ſaw Chriſt, who ſaid to him: *Make haſte, and get thee quickly out of Jeruſalem. For they will not receive thy teſtimonie concerning me.* *Paul* pleaded, that they muſt needs pay a regard to his teſtimonie, who was well known to have been for ſome while very zealous in oppoſing his followers, and was now convinced and perſuaded. But the Lord ſaid unto him: *Depart. For I will ſend*

ſend thee far hence unto the Gentils. This tranſe, or viſion, ſeems to have happened in the year 44. after that *Paul* had preached at *Antioch* with great ſucceſſe among Gentils. Nevertheleſs he had an earneſt deſire to make one attempt more among the Jews of *Judea*, where was the body of that people. And if they could have been perſuaded, many abroad would follow their example. And it required an expreſs and repeated order from Jeſus Chriſt, in viſion, to induce him to lay aſide that deſign, and to proceed to preach to Gentils in remote parts.

It is a moſt affectionate concern, which he expreſſes for the Jewiſh people in divers places of the epiſtle to the *Romans*, writ ſo late as the year 58. ch. ix. 1....5. x. 1. 2. xi. 4. *if by any means*, ſays he, *I may provoke them to emulation which are my fleſh, and might ſave ſome of them.* Nor can it be queſtioned, that the like ſentiments prevailed in the other Apoſtles. If it needs any proof, let St. *Peter*'s diſcourſes at the beginning of the book of the Acts be conſulted, particularly ch. ii. 38...40. iii. 22...26. not to refer to any other.

4. There

4. There were many advantages attending the ſtay of the Apoſtles in *Judea*. Many more Jews were by this means converted, than otherwiſe there would have been. St. *Luke* ſays, Acts iv. 4. that *the number of the men was five thouſand.* But when *Paul* came to *Jeruſalem* ſome years afterwards, *James* ſays to him, *Thou ſeeſt, brother, how many thouſands of Jews there are which believe.* xxi. 20. And it is very likely, that the Jewiſh believers had better, and freer principles, than otherwiſe they would have had. They were, it is true, for obſerving the law themſelves: ver. 20. but they agreed, that the Gentils were under no ſuch obligations. ver. 25. Farther, by this means every ſtep taken in planting the Chriſtian Religion, and ſpreading the goſpel in the world, had the ſanction of all the Apoſtles, and of the whole church of *Jeruſalem.*

Upon occaſion of the perſecution at *Jeruſalem*, many were *ſcattered abroad, who went every where preaching the word. Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Chriſt unto them.* Acts viii. 45. *Now when the Apoſtles, which were at Jeruſalem, heard, that Samaria had received the word of God, they ſent unto them Peter and John.*

This

This was the firſt ſtep taken in carrying the goſpel to any, beſide native Jews, and proſelytes to their religion. And what had been done by *Philip* at *Samaria*, was approved and ratified by all the Apoſtles.

The next ſtep was preaching to Gentils, which work was ſolemnly allotted to *Peter*. *And the Apoſtles and Elders that were in Judea, heard that the Gentils alſo had received the word of God.* ch. xi. 1. Upon *Peter*'s rehearſing to them the whole affair, and what had happened at the houſe of *Cornelius* at *Ceſarea*, all were ſatisfied. *They glorified God, ſaying: Then hath God alſo to the Gentils granted repentance unto life.* ver. 18.

Soon after this, ſome of thoſe who were ſcattered abroad upon the perſecution, went to *Antioch*, and there *ſpake to the Greeks*, or Gentils, *preaching the Lord Jeſus. And a great number believed, and turned to the Lord. Then tidings of theſe things came unto the ears of the church, which was at Jeruſalem. And they ſent forth Barnabas, that he ſhould go as far as Antioch.* ver. 19.... 22. This ſtep therefore was alſo approved and ratified by the whole church of *Jeruſalem*, including the Apoſtles.

And henceforward no objections could be made

made by wiſe men againſt preaching to Gentils, and receiving them, but what aroſe from the difficulty of the work. Nevertheleſs ſome good while after this, there was a diſpute raiſed at *Antioch* by ſome bigotted Jews, who aſſerted it to be neceſſarie, that the Gentil believers *ſhould be circumciſed after the manner of Moſes.* This occaſioned the Council of *Jeruſalem.* Where the controverſie was fully determined by the Apoſtles and Elders. Which was a great advantage. By this means the manner of receiving Gentils was fixed, and ſettled beyond diſpute, and beyond oppoſition. Or, if any ſhould be made afterwards, it could not be ſucceſsful, nor very troubleſome. And we may be aſſured, that all the Apoſtles, and their diſciples, would be harmonious, and preach the ſame doctrine to Jews and Gentils, whereſoever they went.

5. There was a neceſſity of the Apoſtles ſtaying in *Judea,* till about this time. Otherwiſe, they could not have ſufficiently teſtified the doctrine concerning Jeſus in *Judea,* nor have fully taught the Jewiſh People, ſo as to render them inexcuſable, if they did not believe, and repent.

If we conſider the ſtate of things in *Judea,* we

we may diſcern, that in the year 44. the Apoſtles had not had an opportunity to fulfill their miniſtrie in that countrey. It muſt be evident to all from the hiſtorie in the Acts, that for ſome while, ſoon after our Lord's aſcenſion, the Apoſtles were grievouſly haraſſed, and hardly uſed by the Jewiſh Council or Rulers. Which was the more ſo, becauſe of the weakneſſe of *Pilate*'s government, for ſome time before he was diſmiſſed from the province. And afterwards, about the time of his removal, *Stephen* was ſtoned, and a great perſecution began. Which, as I apprehend, continued from the begining of the year 36. to the begining of the year 40. When the churches had reſt. Of which reſt undoubtedly the Apoſtles made good uſe. St. *Luke*'s words are: *Then had the churches reſt throughout Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified, and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghoſt, were multiplied.* ch. xi. 31. After which follows an account of *Peter*'s paſſing throughout all quarters, his going to *Lydda*, and there healing *Eneas*, then to *Joppa*, where he raiſed *Tabitha*: and from thence to *Ceſarea*, and there preaching to *Cornelius*, and his companie: and of ſome other matters,

reaching to ch. xi. 26. How long that reſt, or peace and tranquillity continued, in all it's fullneſſe, we cannot ſay exactly. Perhaps it laſted a year, or more. And it is not unlikely, that in that ſpace of time other Apoſtles, beſide *Peter*, travelled in *Judea*, and the ſeveral parts of it, preaching the goſpel, and confirming the diſciples. But upon *Herod Agrippa* being made King of all *Judea* by *Claudius* in the year 41. that peace would be abated, if not interrupted. From the begining of his reign, eſpecially from his arrival in *Judea*, and during the remainder of it, the diſciples muſt have been under many difficulties and diſcouragements, Prince and People being of one mind. And toward the end of his reign he became an open and violent perſecutor, till Divine Providence ſmote him, that he died. After his death *Judea* came to be in the hands of Roman Procurators, *Cuſpius Fadus*, *Tiberius Alexander*, *Cumanus*, *Felix*, *Feſtus*: When, probably, the diſciples of Jeſus had for ſeveral years together more liberty, than they had had at any time, ſince the reſurrection of Jeſus, excepting the interval of reſt and tranquillity, before taken notice of. For thoſe Governours, or Procurators, had no orders from the Roman Emperour to perſecute

ſecute or diſturb any Jews. And that thoſe Governours were not diſpoſed to diſturb the Chriſtians, may be argued from the treatment given to *Paul* by *Felix*, and *Feſtus*, and the officers under them. Now therefore from the year 44. to the time of the Council in 49. or 50. and afterwards, the Apoſtles went on fulfilling their miniſtrie. All of them, as I apprehend, ſtaid in *Judea* till the time of the Council. Soon after which ſome did, probably, go abroad. However, ſeveral of them might ſtay there a good while longer, and not remove, till a little before the commencement of the Jewiſh war in 66.

6. We may now perceive, the benefit of the early choice and call of *Paul* to be an Apoſtle. Who having been ſeveral years employed and exerciſed in preaching to Jews in *Judea*, and out of it, was ready to preach to Gentils likewiſe, as ſoon as a door was opened for applying to them at *Antioch*, and other places: as there was, after *Peter* had received *Cornelius* at *Ceſarea*: whilſt it was not as yet fit for any of the twelve Apoſtles to leave the land of *Iſrael*.

7. We now obtain ſome aſſiſtance for interpreting thoſe expreſſions of *Paul*: Gal. ii. 7. 8. 9. *When they ſaw, that the goſpel of the un-*

circumciſion was committed unto me, as the goſpel of the circumciſion was committed unto Peter. For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apoſtleſhip of the circumciſion, the ſame was mighty in me toward the Gentils. And they gave unto me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowſhip, that we ſhould go unto the Heathen, and they unto the circumciſion. And Rom. xi. 13. *inaſmuch as I am the Apoſtle of the Gentils, I magnify my office.* Thoſe expreſſions cannot be intended to ſignify, that *Paul* was Apoſtle of the Gentils only, and excluſive of the Jews: or that *Peter* and the other of the twelve, were Apoſtles of the circumciſion only, excluſive of the Gentils. For an Apoſtle is a teacher or maſter of the whole world. They were appointed to be ſo by Chriſt himſelf. Nor could their commiſſion be limited by any compact among themſelves. Our Lord's commiſſion given to his twelve Apoſtles, is, in *Matthew*, to this purpoſe: *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations.* xxviii. 19. and in *Luke:* xxiv. 46. 47. *he ſaid to them, that repentance and forgiveneſſe of ſins ſhould be preached in his name among all nations, begining at Jeruſalem.* And Acts i. 8. And *Ye ſhall be witneſſes unto me in Jeruſalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermoſt*

uttermoſt part of the earth. And Mark xvi. 15. *And he ſaid unto them: Go ye into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature.* And ver. 20. *And they went forth and preached every where.* Of *Paul* the Lord ſays in a viſion to *Ananias* at *Damaſcus: He is a choſen veſſel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentils, and Kings, and the children of Iſrael.* Acts ix. 5. And *Paul* ſays to King *Agrippa: I was not diſobedient to the heavenly viſion: but ſhewed firſt unto them of Damaſcus, and at Jeruſalem, and throughout all the coaſt of Judea, and then to the Gentils, that they ſhould repent, and turn to God.* ch. xxvi. 19. 20. Moreover we know from the hiſtorie of *Paul*'s preaching recorded in the Acts, that he always firſt addreſſed himſelf to Jews, in all the places where he came, if there were any, and if they had there a ſynagogue.

It ſhould be obſerved likewiſe, that *Peter* had actually preached to Gentils, in *Judea*, and was the firſt diſciple of Jeſus, that did ſo. There is a particular account of it in the book of the Acts ch. x. and xi. And himſelf takes notice of it in his ſpeech at the Council of *Jeruſalem.* ch. xv. 7.

The reaſon therefore, why the goſpel of the circumciſion is ſaid to have been com-

mitted unto *Peter*, and the other Apoſtles with him, is, that for a good while, their miniſtry was ſoly, or however very much, and chiefly, employed among Jews in *Judea*: though afterwards they preached very freely to Gentils, in ſeveral parts of the world. And *Paul* is called the Apoſtle of the Gentils, and the goſpel of the uncircumciſion is ſaid to have been committed unto him, becauſe he got the ſtart of all the reſt in preaching to Gentils, and had labored among them for a good while in divers countreys, with great ſucceſſe, and had formed many churches in divers places: whilſt they were ſtill in *Judea*, teaching Jews, and had made no addreſſes to Gentils abroad in other countreys.

It may be alſo implied in what St. *Paul* ſays in the epiſtle to the *Galatians*, that *(b)* ſeveral

(b) Alterum, quod ex dicto Pauli ad Galatas colligimus, illud eſt, Joannem etiam poſt diſceſſum Pauli cum duobus collegis per aliquod temporis intervallum Hieroſolymis, et in Judaea ſubſtitiſſe. Gentium enim converſione Paulo et Barnabae demandata, ipſi inter Judaeos ſe operam porro locaturos declarant. Quae etiam cauſſa eſt, cur Joannis et ſociorum in Actis Apoſtolicis vix mentio occurrat, quia poſtquam primordia Eccleſiae Chriſtianae inter Judaeos memorata erant, nihil amplius videbatur addendum, niſi ut narretur, quomodo primitiae Gentium eſſent introductae. *Lamp. Proleg. in Jo. l. 1. cap, 3. §. vii.*

ſeveral of the firſt twelve Apoſtles intended to ſtay ſtill ſomewhat longer in *Judea*. This they were the more willing to do, being fully ſatisfied with the preaching of *Paul* in foreign countreys: inſomuch that they encouraged him to proceed, as he had begun.

8. Once more, we may now be reconciled to the ſuppoſition of the late date of the Goſpels. For they were not to be publiſhed, till the doctrine concerning Jeſus had been preached in divers parts, and many converts had been made, to whom they would be uſeful, for whom they would be needful, by whom they would be received with joy, be highly valued, frequently read, and often copied. Written hiſtories of Jeſus could be little wanted by the Jewiſh believers in *Judea*, whilſt all the Apoſtles were ſtill in that countrey, and there were alſo ſtill living among them many ſincere followers of Jeſus, and eye-witneſſes of his perſon and miniſtrie. Very probably, therefore, there was no written goſpel, till after the Council at *Jeruſalem*.

Still there may be objections, which ſhould be ſtated and conſidered.

Obj. 1. It may be ſaid: Was not the progreſſe of the goſpel by this means much retarded? I anſwer: No. And this objec-

tion, methinks, ſhould be of little moment now, after all that has been ſaid of the many advantages of the Apoſtles ſtay in *Judea*.

However, ſome conſiderations ſhall be here added to what has been already ſaid. Though the Apoſtles did not leave *Judea* themſelves, they encouraged thoſe who did, who preached the goſpel abroad, whether to Jews or Gentils. Of this there is an inſtance with regard to the church of *Antioch*, related Acts xi. 19 . . 22. And there may have been ſome other like inſtances. Moreover the Apoſtles were very uſeful by their ſtay in *Judea*, as has been already ſhewn. They made many converts among the Jews. During their ſtay in that countrey, if there was any meaſure of public liberty for the believers, the Apoſtles would all, or moſt of them, be at *Jeruſalem*, at the great feaſts, to which there was a general reſort of Jews from all countreys. Here the inquiſitive of that People would have an opportunity of converſing with the Apoſtles. And if they were convinced, and perſuaded by them, they would carry the doctrine of the goſpel into the places of their uſual reſidence, and propagate it there.

Obj. 2.

Obj. 2. But, if the Apoſtles had attempted to make a long ſtay in *Judea*, it ſeems, that they muſt have been all deſtroyed. I anſwer, that doubtleſs they met with many and great difficulties. What they were from the time of our Lord's aſcenſion to the year 44. was briefly rehearſed juſt now. After that, for ſeveral years, as I apprehend, their difficulties would not be ſo great, as they had been. Yea, during that ſpace would be the beſt opportunity that ever they had, to promote the intereſts of the goſpel, as I ſaid before. For *(i)* the Jewiſh People had not the power of life and death in their own hands. And the Roman Procurators were not

(i) Contra perſuaſum habeo, hoc emblema ſupponere, Eccleſiam jam longo admodum tempore fuiſſe afflictam . . . Ne jam dicam, non conſtare ex hiſtoria Eccleſiae, quinam illi ſint *Martyres*, quorum *ſanguis*, praeter eum *Stephani*, et utriuſque *Jacobi*, de quorum altero ex Luca, altero ex Joſepho liquet et Hegeſippo, a Judaeis fuſus fuerit. Judaei enim, excepto brevi intervallo regni Agrippae, rerum ſuarum non erant domini : et licet in Chriſtianos peſſime affecti fuerint, a Praeſidibus tamen Romanis prohibebantur, pro lubitu in innocuos Jeſu Chriſti diſcipulos ſaevire. Quae enim junior Ananus tentavit in Jacobum fratrem Domini, et τινὰς ἑτέρους, *quoſdam al.os*, Chriſtianae profeſſionis homines, ut conſtat ex Joſepho, Feſto mortuo, et Albino adhuc in itinere agente, peracta ſunt. *Campeg. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. vi. ver.* 12. §. *xxx. p.* 303.

not diſpoſed to give any men diſturbance upon account of difference of opinion in religious matters. Finally, the Apoſtles of Jeſus Chriſt, we have reaſon to think, had an eſpecial direction, and an eſpecial protection. They, who were employed in teaching ſo important a doctrine, and were enabled to work miracles upon others for confirming it, may be reaſonably ſuppoſed to have been the ſubjects of ſome wonderful interpoſitions of Providence. And it muſt be reckoned very probable, that affairs would be ſo over-ruled and influenced, as that theſe choſen men ſhould be upheld, and enabled to fulfill their miniſtrie, and bear ſuch a teſtimonie to Jeſus, as ſhould be ſufficient to lay a good foundation for the eſtabliſhment of his Church in the world, and leave all thoſe of the Jewiſh People, who did not receive him as the Meſſiah, abſolutly inexcuſable.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

St. Mark, *Evangeliſt.*

I. *That the Evangeliſt is the ſame as John Mark, and nephew to Barnabas.* II. *His Hiſtorie from the New Teſtament.* III. *From other Writers.* IV. *Teſtimonies to his Goſpel, in ancient Writers.* V. *Remarks upon them.* VI. *The Time of writing his Goſpel, according to theſe ancient Writers, and the Sentiments of learned Moderns.* VII. *Characters of Time in the Goſpel itſelf.* VIII. *Obſervations upon this Goſpel.*

I. IT is generally, or even univerſally, allowed, that *Mark*, mentioned 1 Pet. v. 13. is the Evangeliſt. But it has been doubted, whether he be the ſame as *John Mark* mentioned in the Acts, and ſome of St. *Paul*'s epiſtles. And it appears from our collections out of ancient authors, that there were

The Evangeliſt the ſame as John Mark.

were doubts about this in the minds of ſome in former times.

Divers learned moderns are perſuaded, that they are different perſons. Of this number are *(a) Cave*, [who nevertheleſs thinks him *(b)* the ſame *Mark*, that is mentioned by St. *Paul* in his ſecond epiſtle to *Timothie*,] *(c) Grotius*, *(d) Du Pin*, and *(e) Tillemont*. Which laſt, in his Eccleſiaſtical Memoirs, makes two different articles for this name: one entitled, St. *Mark the Evangeliſt, Apoſtle of Egypt, and Martyr*: the other, St. *John Mark, diſciple and couſin of St. Barnabas*. On the other hand they are reckoned one and the ſame by *(f) Jer. Jones*, *(g) Lightfoot*, and *(h) Wetſtein*.

I ſhall

(a) S. Marcus Evangeliſta, quem cum Joanne Marco, de quo Act. xii. 12. male nonnulli confundunt. *H. L. T. i. p.* 24.

(b) Cum enim illum epiſtola ſecunda ad Timotheum — Romam accerſiverat Paulus — *Id. ib.*

(c) Gr. Pr. in Marc.

(d) Diſſ. Prelim. l. 2. ch. ii. §. iv.

(e) Mem. Ec. Tom. 2.

(f) New and full Method. vol. 3. ch. vi. p. 65 . . 70.

(g) Lightfoot is making obſervations upon the firſt epiſtle of St. *Peter*. "He ſends this epiſtle, ſays he, by *Silvanus*, *Paul*'s old attendant, but now with *Peter* . . His naming of *Mark*

I ſhall now without delay conſider the reaſons of thoſe, who think there are two *Marks* mentioned in the New Teſtament.

1. They ſay, that *Mark* the Evangeliſt was converted and baptiſed by *Peter*, becauſe he calls him *his ſon*. 1 Pet. v. 13. But there is no reaſon to ſuppoſe this of *John Mark*.

To which I anſwer. That needs not to be reckoned the conſtant meaning of the expreſſion. It may denote only great affection and tenderneſſe, and a reſpect to faithful ſervices: in like manner as *Paul* ſays of *Timothie*. Philip. ii. 22. that *as a ſon with the father he had ſerved with him in the*

Mark with him calls our thoughts back to what has been mentioned of *Mark* heretofore: his being with *Paul* at *Rome*, and his coming from him into the Eaſt. To ſuppoſe two *Marks*, one with *Peter*, and another with *Paul*, is to breed confuſion, where there needeth not. . . It is eaſily ſeen, how *John Mark* came into familiarity with *Paul* and *Peter*. And other *Mark* we can find none in the New Teſtament, unleſs of our own invention. . . . He it was, that wrote the Goſpel. *Lightfoot Harm. of the N. T. Vol. i. p.* 336.

(h) Nihil vetat, quo minus ſimpliciter cum Victore et Theophylacto hunc eundem Marcum intelligamus, quoties illius nomen in Actis et Epiſtolis reperimus. *Wetſt. Pr. in Marc. Tom. i. p.* 551.

the goſpel. *Grotius (i)* and *Du Pin (k)* who mention this reaſon, ſeem not to have judged it concluſive. Moreover, if *Mark* was a convert of *Peter*, it does not follow, that he was not an early believer. For he might be one of that Apoſtle's converts at his firſt preaching the goſpel at *Jeruſalem*. *Mark* the Evangeliſt, upon that ſuppoſition, could not be one of the ſeventy: but he might be among the firſt believers, and the ſon of *Marie*. However, I chooſe not to inſiſt upon this, but chiefly upon what was before mentioned: that the appellation, *my ſon*, needs not to be underſtood rigorouſly, as meaning a convert begotten to the faith of the goſpel.

2. It is ſaid, that *(l) Mark*, the companion of *Paul*, was called *John*: but the Evangeliſt

(i) Adde, quod Joannes Marcus inter primos Chriſtianos: Marcus hic, ut videtur, Petri opera converſus. 1 Pet. v. 13. Nam tales peculiariter *filios ſuos* Apoſtoli vocabant. 1 Cor. iv. 15. Gal. iv. 19. *Gr. Pr. in Marc.*

(k) Il y a plus d'apparence, qu'il a reçû l'evangile de S. Pierre, qui l'appelle fils, peutêtre parcequ'il l'avoit engendré en J. C. *Diſſ. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. §. iv.*

(l) Joannes quoque ille Mariae filius, Barnabae conſanguineus, . . . Marcus vocabatur: quem multi hunc noſtrum ſcriptorem putant. Quibus quo minus aſſentiar, moveor

Evangeliſt is never ſo called by the ancients, who mention him.

To which I anſwer. It is true, that *Paul*'s companion is ſometimes called *John*, as Acts xiii. 5. and 13. But we are alſo informed that he was ſurnamed *Mark*. So Acts xii. 12. *And when he had conſidered the thing, he came to the houſe of Marie, the mother of John, whoſe ſurname was Mark.* And ver. 25. . . . *and took with them John, whoſe ſurname was Mark.* And he is ſeveral times mentioned by the ſurname, *Mark*, only. Acts xv. 39. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Col. iv. 10. Philem. ver. 24. *Secondly*, ſuch of the ancients, as ſuppoſed *Mark*, the Evangeliſt, to have been the ſame with him mentioned in the Acts, muſt alſo have ſuppoſed, that he was called *John*, as well as *Mark*, though they have generally mentioned him by his ſurname.

3. It is ſaid, that *(m) John Mark* was much

moveor veterum auctoritate, qui hunc ſcriptorem Joannem nunquam, Marcum ſemper vocant. . . . *Grot. Pr. in Marc.*

L' Evangeliſte n'eſt appellé nulle part du nom de Jean, qui étoit le nom propre de celuici. *Du Pin, ubi ſupra.*

(m) Et ita Petro addunt [Veteres] comitem, ac diſcipulum, ut non tantum de Barnaba, ſed et de Paulo, quem Joannes

much with *Paul*, *Mark*, the Evangeliſt, with *Peter*. So ſay the ancients in general.

I anſwer: It is not at all impoſſible, but that *Mark* might be ſometimes with *Paul*, at other times with *Peter*. As may appear by and by.

As theſe reaſons therefore do not appear to me concluſive, I rather think, that there is but one *Mark* in the New Teſtament, *John Mark*, the Evangeliſt, and fellow-laborer of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and *Peter*.

His hiſtorie from the N. T.

II. I now proceed to write the hiſtorie of *John Mark* from the New Teſtament, mentioning, as they offer, ſome obſervations, ſhewing his acquaintance with *Peter*, as well as with *Paul*. After which I ſhall take notice of ſome other things ſaid of him by the ancients.

He was the ſon of *Marie*, a pious woman at *Jeruſalem*, and an early believer, at whoſe houſe the diſciples uſed to meet, and that in troubleſome and difficult times, as well as at other ſeaſons. *Peter* having been de-

Joannes Marcus poſt illud friguſculum ſectatus eſt .... nihil meminerint. *Grot. ibid.*

Il étoit diſciple de S. Pierre, et attaché à lui, dans le tems que l' autre étoit avec S. Paul, et S. Barnabe. *Du Pin. Ibid.*

delivered out of priſon by an angel, *came to the houſe of Marie, mother of John, whoſe ſurname was Mark, where many were gathered together praying.* Acts xii. 12. So that the very firſt mention of *John Mark* aſſures us of *Peter*'s intimacie in that familie.

That deliverance of St. *Peter* happened in the year 44. about the ſame time that *Paul* and *Barnabas* came to *Jeruſalem* from *Antioch* with contributions for the relief of the brethren in *Judea* in the time of a famine, or ſcarcity. And it is ſaid at the end of that chapter. *And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jeruſalem, when they had fulfilled their miniſtrie, and took with them John, whoſe ſurname was Mark.* This, with ſome other things to be hereafter mentioned, may diſpoſe us to think, that this *John Mark* is the ſame, who in Col. iv. 10. is called *ſiſter's ſon to Barnabas.*

Mark therefore went now from *Jeruſalem* to *Antioch*, with *Paul* and *Barnabas*. And, when ſome ſhort time afterwards, they went abroad to other countreys, *Mark* accompanied them, as *their miniſter.* Acts xiii. 5. They went to *Cyprus*, and preached the word in that countrey. But when they returned to the continent, and came on ſhore

at *Perga in Pamphylia, he departed from them, and returned to Jeruſalem.* ver. 13. He therefore did not attend them in their farther progreſſe to *Antioch in Piſidia, Iconium*, and other places, but went to *Jeruſalem.*

And now, very probably, he converſed again with *Peter*, and the other Apoſtles, and was preſent with them at their diſcourſes, and their devotions. For, as I apprehend, all the Apoſtles were ſtill in *Judea*, except *James* the ſon of *Zebedee*, who had been beheaded by *Herod Agrippa*, in the begining of the year 44.

Paul and *Barnabas* having finiſhed their progreſſe, returned to *Antioch*, and there abode. Whilſt they were there, debates aroſe about circumciſing Gentil converts. Which determined *Paul* and *Barnabas* to go to *Jeruſalem.* That controverſie being decided, they returned to *Antioch.*

Some time afterwards *Paul ſaid unto Barnabas: Let us go again, and viſit our brethren, in every city, where we have preached the word, and ſee how they do. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whoſe ſurname was Mark. But Paul thought it not good to take him with them, who had departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not*

with

with them to the work. *Barnabas*, however, perſiſted in his reſolution, and went with *Mark* to *Cyprus*. And *Paul* choſe *Silas* to accompany him. Acts xv. 36 . . . . 41.

Hereby we perceive the good temper of *Mark*. He was now at *Antioch*, and was willing to attend *Paul* and *Barnabas* in their journeys, and actually went with *Barnabas* to *Cyprus*. And though *Paul* would not now accept of his attendance, he was afterwards fully reconciled to him. *Mark* is mentioned in ſeveral of his epiſtles ſent from *Rome*, during his confinement there. I ſuppoſe, I ſhall hereafter ſhew, that St. *Paul*'s ſecond epiſtle to *Timothie* was writ in the ſummer of the year 61. not long after *Paul*'s arrival at *Rome*. In that epiſtle he writes to *Timothie*, to come to him. And he deſires him to bring *Mark* with him. 2 Tim. iv. 11. *Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the miniſtrie.* Where *Mark* then was, does not clearly appear. It is probable, that he was either at *Epheſus*, or at ſome other place, where *Timothie* would find him in his journey from *Epheſus* to *Rome*. And, unqueſtionably, *Mark* did come with *Timothie*. He is mentioned in two of the epiſtles writ by the Apoſtle at

Rome. Philem. ver. 24. and Col. iv. 10. *Ariſtarchus ſalutes you, and Mark, ſiſter's ſon to Barnabas, touching whom ye received commandments. If he come unto you, receive him.* *Mark* is not mentioned in the epiſtle to the *Philippians.* Perhaps he was not acquainted there, or upon ſome occaſion was abſent from the Apoſtle, when that epiſtle was writ. Or rather, he is comprehended in thoſe general expreſſions. ch. iv. 21. *The brethren that are with me, greet you.* For in the epiſtle to the *Philippians* St. *Paul* does not mention his fellow-laborers by name, as he does in the epiſtles to the *Coloſſians,* and to *Philemon.* Nor is he mentioned in the epiſtle to the *Epheſians.* To thoſe who admit the true date of that epiſtle the reaſon will be obvious. It was writ, and ſent away, before *Mark* came to be with St. *Paul* at *Rome.*

This is all we can ſay concerning St. *Mark* from the New Teſtament. But from that we can collect his excellent character, and may conclude, that after this time he no longer attended on *Paul.* It is not improbable, that going now into *Aſia,* he there met with St. *Peter,* and accompanied him, till that Apoſtle came to *Rome,* where he ſuffered martyrdom. Where likewiſe *Mark* wrote,

wrote, and publiſhed the Goſpel that goes by his name.

III. We will now inquire, whether there is any thing in other writers to illuſtrate the hiſtorie of this Evangeliſt. *From other Writers.*

Cave ſays, without heſitation, that *(n) Mark* was a *Levite*. But he does not ſay, upon what authority. I do not remember, that it is in any of the writers, of which I have given a particular account, excepting *(o) Bede*. It is alſo in a commentarie upon St. *Mark*'s Goſpel, uſually joyned with *Jerome*'s works, though *(p)* allowed not to be his. That writer ſays, that *(q) Mark* was *a Levite*, and a Prieſt. It is not unlikely, that this was inferred from *Mark*'s relation to *Barnabas*, who was a *Levite of Cyprus*.

(n) S. Marcus, Evangeliſta, quem cum Johanne Marco, de quo Act. xii. 12. male nonnulli confundunt, erat Levites. *H. L. T. i. p.* 24.

(o) Tradunt autem hunc, natione Iſraelitica, et ſacerdotali ortum proſapia, ac poſt paſſionem ac reſurrectionem Domini Salvatoris, ad praedicationem Apoſtolorum Evangelica fide a ſacramentis imbutum, atque ex eorum fuiſſe numero, de quibus ſcribit Lucas, quia multa etiam turba ſacerdotum obediebat fidei. *Bed. Prol. in Marc.*

(p) Vid. Benedictin Monitum, et Petav. Animadv. ad Epiph. H. 21. *num. vi. p.* 88.

(q) Marcus Evangeliſta Dei, Petri diſcipulus, Leviticus genere, et ſacerdos, in Italia hoc ſcripſit Evangelium. *Praef. in Marc. ap. Hierom. T. v. p.* 886.

Comp. Acts. iv. 36. and Col. iv. 10. But then *Cave* ſhould not have denied, as he does in the ſame place, that *Mark* the Evangeliſt is the ſame as *John Mark*, mentioned in the Acts. For that, as I apprehend, is to remove out of the way the ſole ground of this opinion.

By *Euſebe* we are informed, it *(r)* was ſaid, that *Mark* going into *Egypt*, firſt preached there the Goſpel, which he had writ, and planted there many churches. And afterwards, in another chapter, he ſays, that *(s)* in the eighth year of *Nero*, *Anianus*, the firſt Biſhop of *Alexandria* after *Mark*, the Apoſtle and Evangeliſt, took upon him the care of that church. Of which *Anianus* he gives a great character, as beloved of God, and a wonderful man.

Epiphanius ſays, that ſoon after *Matthew*, *Mark*, companion of *Peter*, compoſed his Goſpel at *Rome*. And having *(t)* writ it, he

(r) Τοῦτον δὲ μάρκον πρῶτον φασιν ἐπὶ τῆς αἰγύπτου σταλέντα, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ δὴ καὶ συνεγράψατο κηρύξαι, ἐκκλησίας τε πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἀλεξανδρείας συστήσασθαι. κ. λ. *H. E. l.* 2. *cap.* 16.

(s) . . . πρῶτος μετὰ μάρκον τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴν, τῆς ἐν ἀλεξανδρεία παροικίας ἀννιανὸς τὴν λειτουργίαν διαδέχεται· ἀνὴρ θεοφιλὴς καὶ πάντα θαυμάσιος. *Ib. cap.* 24.

(t) . . καὶ γράψας ἀποστέλλεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πέτρου εἰς τὴν τῶν αἰγυπτίων χώραν. *H.* 51. *num.* vi.

he was ſent by *Peter* into the countrey of the *Egyptians*.

Jerome, in his article of St. *Mark*, as *(u)* before quoted, after other things, ſays: "Taking *(x)* the Goſpel, which himſelf "had compoſed, he went to *Egypt*, and at "*Alexandria* founded a church of great "note . . . He died in the eighth year of "*Nero*, and was buried at *Alexandria*, "where he was ſucceeded, as Biſhop, by "*Anianus*."

From all theſe accounts, I think, it muſt appear to be probable, that if indeed *Mark* preached at all in *Egypt*, and founded a church at *Alexandria*; it muſt have been after he had writ his Goſpel, and after the death of *Peter* and *Paul* at *Rome*. Nevertheleſs, when preſently afterwards *Euſebe*, and *Jerome* likewiſe, ſpeak of *Mark*'s converts, and *Philo*'s Therapeuts, as all one, they ſeem to have imagined, that *Mark* had very early preached in *Egypt*. But what

(u) Vol. x. p. 92. 93.

(x) Aſſumto itaque Evangelio, quod ipſe confecerat, perrexit ad Aeguptum, et primus Alexandriae Chriſtum annuntians conſtituit eccleſiam . . . Denique Philo . . videns Alexandriae primam eccleſiam adhuc judaizantem, quaſi in laudem gentis ſuae, librum ſuper eorum converſatione conſcripſit. *De V. L. cap.* 8.

they ſay upon that head is exceeding ſtrange and unaccountable. For they both ſuppoſe, that *Mark* had writ his goſpel at *Rome*, before he went into *Egyyt:* and that his Goſpel was not writ before the reign of *Nero*. If therefore *Mark* went at all to *Alexandria*, it was later, in the ſame reign: and *Philo*'s Therapeuts could not be Chriſtians, nor *Mark*'s converts: but were a ſort of people, who had a being, and had formed their inſtitution, before the goſpel could be publiſhed in *Egypt*, and before the riſe of the Chriſtian Religion.

By *Baronius (y)* and many others, it is ſaid, that St. *Mark* died a Martyr. This is admitted by *(z) Cave*, and the *(a)* late Mr. *Wetſtein*. But it is diſputed by *(b) S. Baſnage:* and as ſeems to me, with good reaſon. For St. *Mark* is not ſpoken of as a Martyr by *Euſebe*, or other more ancient writers. And

(y) An. 64. §. *i. ii.*

(z) Alexandriae primus Epiſcopus factus Martyrium ibi ſubiit: quo vero anno, mihi hactenus incompertum. *H. L. p.* 24.

(a) Tandem vero in Aegyptum conceſſiſſe, atque Alexandriae ſanguine ſuo doctrinam Chriſti confirmaſſe, hiſtoria eccleſiaſtica teſtatur. *J. J. Wetſten. N. T. Tom. i. p.* 551.

(b) Ann. 66. *num. xix. xx.*

And *Jerome*, as before quoted, ſays, St. *Mark* died in the eighth year of *Nero*, and was buried at *Alexandria*. He does not ſay, that he was crowned with martyrdom: as he would have done, if he had known of it. And his expreſſions ſeems to imply a natural death. *Fabricius (c)* in his account of St. *Mark*, ſays nothing of his having been a Martyr.

Teſtimonies to his Goſpel.

IV. Having thus writ the hiſtorie of St. *Mark*, I ſhall now recollect the teſtimonies to his Goſpel, which we have ſeen in ancient writers, particularly, with a view of aſcertaining the time of it: obſerving likewiſe whatever may farther lead us into the knowledge of his ſtation and character, and whether he was one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples, or not.

The firſt writer to be here taken notice of is *Papias*, about A. D. 116. He ſays, "That *(d)* the Elder, from whom he had "divers informations, ſaid: *Mark*, being the "interpreter of *Peter*, wrote what he re-"membred: but not in the order, in which "things were ſpoken and done by Chriſt. For

(c) Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. n. iii. Tom. 3. p. 130, ... 132.

(d) Vol. i. p. 241.

" For he was not a hearer of the Lord, but " afterwards followed *Peter*."

Irenaeus, as before *(e)* cited, about 178. ſays: " After the death of *Peter* and *Paul*, " *Mark*, the diſciple and interpreter of *Peter*, " delivered to us in writing the things that " had been preached by *Peter*." In another place *(f)* he calls *Mark* " the interpreter " and follower of *Peter*."

Clement, of *Alexandria*, about the year of Chriſt 194. ſays: " That *(g)* *Peter*'s hearers " at *Rome*, not content with a ſingle hear- " ing, nor with an unwritten inſtruction in " the divine doctrine, entreated *Mark*, the " follower of *Peter*, that he would leave " with them in writing a memorial of the " doctrine, which had been delivered to " them by word of mouth. Nor did they " deſiſt, untill they had prevailed with him. " Thus they were the means of writing the " Goſpel, which is called according to *Mark*. " It is ſaid, that when the Apoſtle knew " what had been done, he was pleaſed with " the zeal of the men, and authoriſed that " ſcripture to be read in the churches." That

(e) *Vol. i. p.* 354. *(f)* *P.* 357.
(g) *Vol. ii.* 472.

That paſſage is cited from *Euſebe*'s Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie.

Again, *Euſebe* ſays: "*Clement (h)* informs "us, that the occaſion of writing the Goſ- "pel according to *Mark* was this. *Peter*, "having publicly preached the word at *Rome*, "and having ſpoken the goſpel by the Spirit, "many who were there, entreated *Mark* to "write the things that had been ſpoken, he "having long accompanied *Peter*, and re- "taining what he had ſaid: and that when "he had compoſed the Goſpel, he delivered "it to them, who had aſked it of him. "Which when *Peter* knew, he neither for- "bid it, nor encouraged it."

Many remarks were (*i*) formerly made upon theſe accounts of *Clement*, which cannot now be repeated. But it may be needful to ſay ſomething here for reconciling *Irenaeus* and him. *Irenaeus* ſaid, that *Mark* publiſhed his Goſpel *after the death of Peter and Paul:* whereas *Clement* ſuppoſes *Peter* to have been ſtill living, and that this Goſpel was ſhewn to *Peter*, who did not diſapprove of it. But the difference is not great.

Clement

(*h*) P. 475.
(*i*) *Vol. i. p.* 245...249. *Vol. ii. p.* 476...493.

Clement ſays, that *Mark*'s Goſpel was writ at *Rome* at the requeſt of the Chriſtians there, who were hearers of *Peter*. If ſo, it could not be compoſed long before *Peter*'s death. For I take it to be certain, that *Peter* did not come to *Rome*, untill the reign of *Nero* was far advanced, nor very long before his own death. So that it may be reckoned not improbable, that *Mark*'s Goſpel was not publiſhed, or did not become generally known, till after the death of *Peter* and *Paul*, as *Irenaeus* ſays.

Tertullian, about the year 200. ſpeaks of *Mark* as *(k)* an apoſtolical man, or companion of Apoſtles: and ſays, "That *(l)* "the Goſpel, publiſhed by *Mark*, may be "reckoned *Peter*'s, whoſe interpreter he "was."

Says *Origen*, about 230. "The *(m)* ſe-"cond Goſpel is that according to *Mark*, "who wrote it as *Peter* dictated it to him. "Who therefore calls him his ſon in his ca-"tholic epiſtle." See 1 *Peter* v. 13.

Euſebe, about 315. may be ſuppoſed to agree in the main with *Clement* and *Irenaeus*, whoſe

(k) See Vol. ii. p. 576. . . 588. *(l) P.* 581.
(m) Vol. viii. p. 235.

whoſe paſſages he has tranſcribed, and inſerted in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie. And in a long paſſage of his Evangelical Demonſtration, formerly (*n*) tranſcribed by us, he ſays: "*Peter* out of abundance of modeſtie "thought not himſelf worthie to write a "Goſpel. But *Mark*, who was his friend "and diſciple, is ſaid to have recorded "*Peter*'s relations of the acts of Jeſus." At the end of which paſſage he ſays: "And "(*o*) *Peter* teſtifies theſe things of himſelf. "For all things in *Mark* are ſaid to be me-"moirs of *Peter*'s diſcourſes." He likewiſe ſays, "that (*p*) *Mark* was not preſent to hear "what Jeſus ſaid." Nor (*q*) does it appear, that he thought the writer of the Goſpel to be *John*, ſurnamed *Mark*, nephew to *Barnabas*. But unqueſtionably he ſuppoſed him to be the ſame that is mentioned 1 Pet. v. 13.

Mark is mentioned among the other Evangeliſts by (*r*) *Athanaſius*, without other particularities. But in the Synopſis, aſcribed to him, and by many ſuppoſed to be writ by another *Athanaſius*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, near the end of the fifth centurie, it is ſaid, That

(*n*) *Vol. viii.* 86... 88.
(*o*) *P.* 88. (*p*) *P.* 86. (*q*) *P.* 143.
(*r*) *Vol. viii. p.* 227.

" That (s) the Goſpel according to *Mark* " was dictated by *Peter* at *Rome*, and pub- " liſhed by *Mark*, and preached by him in " *Alexandria*, and *Egypt*, and *Pentapolis*, " and *Lybia*."

The author of the Dialogue againſt the *Marcionites*, about 330. ſays, that (t) *Mark* was one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples.

Epiphanius, about 368. ſays: " *Matthew* " (u) wrote firſt, and *Mark* ſoon after him, " being a companion of *Peter* at *Rome*." Afterwards he ſays, "That (x) *Mark* was " one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples, and like- " wiſe one of thoſe who were offended at " the words of Chriſt, recorded John vi. 44. " and then forſook him: but he was after- " wards recovered by *Peter*, and being filled " with the Spirit wrote a Goſpel."

Upon the laſt paſſage of *Epiphanius Petavius* ſays: " *Mark* (y) might, poſſibly, have

(s) *Vol. viii. p.* 250. (t) *P.* 255.
(u) *P.* 305. (x) *P.* 306.

(y) Diſſentit Papias apud Euſebium. . . . Quod autem aſſerunt nonnulli, Marcum non vidiſſe Dominum, viderit necne non affirmo. Videre quidem potuiſſe, temporum ipſa ratio perſuadet. Neque vero damnanda eſt Epiphanii ſententia, dum illum e LXXII diſcipulorum numero fuiſſe tradat, etſi contrarium alii patres tradant. *Petav. ad loc. Animadv. p.* 88.

have ſeen Chriſt, and have been one of the ſeventy: but it is ſaid by very few ancient writers of the Church."

In the Conſtitutions *Mark* (*z*) is reckoned with *Luke* a fellow-laborer of *Paul*. Which may induce us to think, that the author ſuppoſed *Mark*, the Evangeliſt, to be *John Mark*, mentioned in the Acts, and ſome of St. *Paul*'s epiſtles.

Gregorie Nazianzen ſays, "That (*a*) *Mark* wrote his Goſpel for the *Italians*," or in *Italie*.

Ebedjeſu ſays, "The (*b*) ſecond Evan-" geliſt is *Mark*, who preached [or wrote] " in Latin, in the famous city of *Rome*."

Jerome's article of this Evangeliſt, in his book of illuſtrious Men, is to this purpoſe: " *Mark* (*c*) the diſciple and interpreter of " *Peter*, at the deſire of the brethren at " *Rome*, wrote a ſhort Goſpel, according to " what he had heard related by *Peter*. " Which when *Peter* knew, he approved " of it, and authoriſed it to be read in the " churches: as *Clement* writes in the ſixth " book of his Inſtitutions, and alſo *Papias*, " Biſhop

(*z*) *Vol. viii. p.* 393. (*a*) *Vol. ix. p.* 133.
(*b*) *P.* 216. (*c*) *Vol. x. p.* 92. 93.

" Biſhop of *Hierapolis*. *Peter* alſo makes " mention of this *Mark* in his epiſtle writ " at *Rome*, which he figuratively calls *Ba-* " *bylon*. . . Taking the Goſpel, which him- " ſelf had compoſed, he went to *Egypt*, and " at *Alexandria* founded a church of great " note. . . . He died in the eighth year of " *Nero*, and was buried at *Alexandria:* where " he was ſucceded, as Biſhop, by *Anianus*."

In the prologue to his Commentarie upon St. *Matthew*, *Jerome* ſays: " The (*c*) ſecond " Evangeliſt is *Mark*, interpreter of the " Apoſtle *Peter*, and the firſt Biſhop of " *Alexandria:* who never ſaw the Lord " himſelf, but related things as he had them " from his maſter, very truly, but not ex- " actly in the order, in which they were " done."

In his Commentarie upon *Philem.* ver. 24. he ſays: " He (*d*) thinks, that *Mark* there " mentioned is the writer of the Goſpel." That *Mark* may be well ſuppoſed to be *John Mark*, mentioned in the Acts, and in Col. iv. 10. where he is ſtiled *nephew to Barnabas*. Whether that *Mark* was the Evangeliſt, was doubted of by ſome. Nor was *Jerome* poſi-

tive.

(*c*) *P.* 83. (*d*) *P.* 93.

tive. But he was inclined to think him the ſame.

Auguſtin (*e*) calls *Mark* and *Luke* diſciples of Apoſtles: and ſays, that *(f) Mark* follows *Matthew*, as his abridger. Upon which ſome remarks were (*g*) made.

By *Chryſoſtom* (*h*) *Mark* is ſaid to have writ his Goſpel in *Egypt*, at the requeſt of the believers there. However, at the end of that paſſage he ſays: "In (*i*) what place each one of the Evangeliſts wrote, cannot be ſaid with certainty." He likewiſe *(k)* calls *Mark* diſciple of *Peter*, and *Peter* his maſter. He muſt have ſuppoſed him the ſame, that is mentioned 1 Pet. v. 13. But I do not recollect him to have any where ſaid, that he was the ſame as *John Mark*.

Victor, writer of a Commentarie upon St. *Mark*'s Goſpel, about the year 401. ſays: "He *(l)* was alſo called *John*: that he "wrote a Goſpel after *Matthew*, and was "the ſon of *Marie*, mentioned Acts xii. "For a while he accompanied *Paul*, and his "relation *Barnabas*. But when he came

(*e*) P. 228. (*f*) P. 229.
(*g*) P. 233.... 236. (*h*) P. 315.
(*i*) P. 316... 318. (*k*) P. 318. 319. 322.
(*l*) *Vol. xi. p.* 30. 31.

" to *Rome*, he joyned *Peter*, and accom-
" panied him. For which reaſon he is
" mentioned 1 Pet. v. 13. *Mark* is alſo
" mentioned by *Paul*, Col. iv. 10. 2 Tim.
" iv. 11. ... When he was obliged to go
" from *Rome*, and was earneſtly deſired by
" the believers there to write a hiſtorie of
" the preaching of the heavenly doctrine,
" he readily complied. This, as he adds,
" is ſaid to have been the occaſion of writing
" the Goſpel according to *Mark*."

Coſmas, of *Alexandria*, about 535. ſays:
" *Mark (m)*, the ſecond Evangeliſt, wrote
" a Goſpel at *Rome*, by the direction of
" *Peter*."

By *Iſidore*, of *Seville*, about 596. *Mark* (*n*) is ſaid to have writ his Goſpel in *Italie*. Afterwards, he ſeems to ſay, it *(o)* was writ at *Alxeandria*. But perhaps no more is meant, than that *Mark* preached at *Alexandria* the Goſpel, which he had writ.

Oecumenius, about 950. upon Acts xiii. 13. ſays: " This *(p) John*, who is alſo
" called *Mark*, nephew to *Barnabas*, wrote
" the Goſpel according to him, and was
" alſo diſciple of *Peter*, of whom he ſays
" in

(*m*) *P.* 267. (*n*) *P.* 367.
(*o*) *P.* 375. (*p*) *P.* 413.

" in his first epistle: *Mark, my son, saluteth*
" *you.*"

Theophylact flourished about 1070. His preface to St. *Mark* is to this purpose: " The " (*q*) Gospel according to *Mark* was writ " at *Rome* ten years after Christ's ascension, " at the request of the believers there. For " this *Mark* was a disciple of *Peter*, whom " he calls his son spiritually. His name was " *John*. He was nephew to *Barnabas*, and " was also a companion of *Paul*."

Euthymius, about 1110. says: " The (*r*) " Gospel of *Mark* was writ about ten years " after our Lord's ascension, at *Rome*, as some " say, or in *Egypt*, according to others. " He says, that at first *Mark* was much " with his uncle *Barnabas*, and *Paul*. Af- " terwards he was with *Peter* at *Rome*, as " the first epistle of the Apostle shews, whom " he there calls his son. From whom also " he received the whole history of the Gos- " pel."

Nicephorus Callisti, about 1325. says: " Two (*s*) only of the twelve, *Matthew and* " *John*, have left memoirs of our Lord's " life on earth: and two of the seventy, " *Mark* and *Luke*." And somewhat lower:

(*q*) P. 421. (*r*) P. 436. (*s*) P. 442.

" After this *Mark* and *Luke* publiſhed their " Goſpels by the direction of *Peter* and " *Paul.*"

I add here one author more, not particularly mentioned in the preceding part of this work, *Eutychius*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, in the tenth centurie: who ſays, " that *(t)* in " the time of the Emperour *Nero*, *Peter* the " prince of the Apoſtles, making uſe of the " pen of *Mark*, wrote a Goſpel at *Rome*, in " the *Roman* language. And he publiſhed " it under *Mark*'s name." By the *Roman*, probably, meaning the *Greek* language, which then very much prevailed in the Roman Empire, as *(u) Selden* has obſerved.

Remarks upon them.

V. Let us now briefly recollect what has paſſed before us, in ſeveral articles.

1. All the ancient writers in general ſuppoſe, the Evangeliſt *Mark* to have been a companion of *Peter* in the later part of his life, and to have had great advantages from that Apoſtle's preaching for compoſing a Goſpel.

2. Though

(t) Et tempore Neronis Caeſaris ſcripſit Petrus, Apoſtolorum princeps, Evangelium Marci, dictante Marco, lingua Romana, in urbe Romae. Sed adtribuit illud Marco. *Eutych. Ann. p.* 335. *Conf. ejuſd. Origines. p.* 35.

(u) Vid. Selden in Eutych. Origin. not. 28. *p.* 152.

2. Though ſome have doubted, who *Mark* was, many have been of opinion, that he was *John Mark*, ſon of *Marie*, a pious Jewiſh woman, and an early believer, of *Jeruſalem*, and nephew to *Barnabas*.

3. If *Mark*, the Evangeliſt, be *John Mark*, as ſeems to me very probable, he was well acquainted with *Barnabas* and *Paul*, and other Apoſtles, and diſciples, eye-witneſſes of Jeſus, beſide *Peter*.

4. Some of the ancient writers, quoted by us, thought *Mark* to have been one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples. Which, I apprehend cannot be either affirmed, or denied with certainty. But, if he was not one of them, he was an early believer, and an early diſciple and companion of Apoſtles, and intimatly converſant with them. Whereby, and by hearing *Peter* preach in *Judea*, and other places, and laſtly at *Rome*, he was well qualified to write a Goſpel.

S. *Baſnage* has ſome obſervations upon this point, which deſerves to be taken notice of. " *Epiphanius (x)* and the Author of the Dia-

(x) Marcum de LXX diſcipulis unum fuiſſe, credidit Epiphanius. . . . Nobis tamen non arridet ea ſententia cum incredibile ſit, Petrum Marco *filii* nomen addidiſſe, ſi de ſeptuaginta

" logue againſt the *Marcionites*, ſuppoſe,
" *Mark* to have been one of Chriſt's ſeventy
" diſciples. But that opinion, ſays he, does
" not appear to me well grounded. It ſeems
" incredible, that *Peter* ſhould call *Mark, his*
" *ſon*, if he was one of the ſeventy, who had
" a commiſſion from Chriſt himſelf, and
" were almoſt equal to Apoſtles. That an-
" cient writer, *Papias*, excludes him from
" that number, ſaying, that *Mark* was not a
" hearer or follower of the Lord. . . . And
" *Tertullian* calls *Mark Peter's interpreter*,
" which office would be below the character
" of one of the ſeventy. . . . Nor does *Origen*
" make him one of the ſeventy, whoſe autho-
" rity muſt be of great weight. . . . However,
" it ſeems to me very probable, that *Mark*
" was one of the five hundred brethren, who
" ſaw Chriſt after his reſurrection. And
" having

tuaginta diſcipulis unus fuiſſet, quos Chriſtus ipſe legaverat, quique ab omni fere parte aequales erant Apoſtolis. Papias quoque vetuſtus ille auctor LXX diſcipulis Marcum eximit... Ex Tertulliano quoque ſcimus, Marcum interpretis officio functum fuiſſe, quod infra LXX dignitateur fuit. . . . Neque LXX diſcipulis eum appoſuit Origenes, cujus non minimi ponderis eſt teſtimonium. . . Nobis tamen eſt admodum probabile, Marcum unum fuiſſe quingentorum fratrum, qui Chriſtum a morte revocatum contemplati ſunt. Cuique, ut teſti oculato, commiſſa eſt ſcribendi Evangelii provincia. *Baſn. Ann.* 66. *num. xvii.*

" having been an eye-witneſſe of that, he " was qualified to write a Goſpel."

Upon which I obſerve: The ſuppoſition, that *Mark* might be one of the five hundred, ſpoken of by St. *Paul* 1. Cor. xv. 6. is a mere conjecture, without any authority, either in Scripture, or antiquity. But I would add a thought or two for ſtrengthening the argument, that *Mark* was not one of the ſeventy diſciples. *Euſebe (y)* in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie, has a chapter concerning the Diſciples of our Saviour. But *Mark* is not there named, as one of them. Nor does *Jerome* ſay any thing of it in his book of Illuſtrious Men: nor elſewhere, that I remember. The ſilence of *Origen*, *Euſebe*, and *Jerome*, upon this head, muſt amount to an argument of no ſmall weight, that there was not in their times any prevailing tradition, that *Mark* was one of the ſeventy. It may be alſo reckoned an argument, that he was not of that number, in that he has not in his Goſpel taken any notice of them, or of the commiſſion given to them. Which is in St. *Luke* only. ch. x. 1. . . 17.

I therefore conclude with ſaying, that *Mvrk* was an early believer, and an early

(y) *H. E. l.* 1. *cap. xii.*

diſciple and fellow-laborer of Apoſtles. But that he ever ſaw, or heard the Lord Jeſus, is not certain.

5. The general account of the above named writers is, that *Mark* wrote his Goſpel at *Rome*. In this there is a remarkable agreement, with a very few exceptions. *Chryſoſtom* indeed ſpeaks of it's being writ in *Egypt*. But he is almoſt ſingular. That it was writ at *Rome*, or in *Italie*, is ſaid not only by *Epiphanius*, *Jerome*, *Gregorie Nazianzen*, *Victor*, and divers others: but the *Egyptian* writers likewiſe all along ſay the ſame thing: that it was writ by *Mark* at *Rome*, in the companie of the Apoſtle *Peter*. So ſay *Clement*, of *Alexandria*, *Athanaſius*, the ſuppoſed author of the Synopſis of Scripture, *Coſmas*, and *Eutychius*, all of *Alexandria*. *Ebedjeſu* likewiſe, in his catalogue of *Syrian* writings, ſays, that *Mark* wrote at *Rome*. And the Latin author of the commentarie upon St. *Mark's Goſpel*, quoted ſome while ago, ſays, that it was writ in *Italie*.

6. This leads us to think, that St. *Mark*'s Goſpel was not writ before the year 63. or 64. For we cannot perceive any good reaſon to think, that St. *Peter* was at *Rome*, till about that time. And this date is ſupported by the teſti-

teſtimonie of that ancient writer, *Irenaeus*, that *Mark* publiſhed his Goſpel *after the deceaſe of Peter and Paul.*

The Time of this Goſpel.

VI. Theſe are obſervations, which the above cited teſtimonies ſeem naturally to afford. But before we proceed any farther, it will be fit for us to take notice of the ſentiments of learned moderns concerning the time of St. *Mark*'s writing his Goſpel.

Cave ſuppoſes St. *Mark* to have publiſhed his Goſpel at *Rome*, in the year of Chriſt 65. His argument for it I place *(z)* below.

Mr. *Jones*'s opinion was, that *(a)* this Goſpel was publiſhed between the year 64. and

(z) Rogatus Romae a fratribus, ſcripſit Evangelium, a Petro approbatum, idque Graeco ſermone Romanis ſatis familiari. Factum id circa ann. 65. Petro et Paulo jam morte ſublatis. Cum enim illum epiſtola ſecunda ad Timotheum non longe ante martyrium ſcripta, Romam accerſiverat Paulus, probabile eſt, Marcum vel eodem, vel ſaltem ſequenti anno illuc veniſſe, ibique Evangelium vel primum condidiſſe, vel prius conditum in publicum edidiſſe. Certe Irenaeus, l. 3. cap. i. et apud Euſebium, l. 5. c. viii. S. Marcum μετὰ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον Evangelium ſuum conſcripſiſſe diſerte tradit. *Cav. H. L. T. i. p.* 24.

(a) Mr. *Jones*'s words are theſe: "Theſe, with ſome other "reaſons, make it evident to me, that St. *Peter* was not at "*Rome*, till the year of Chriſt 63. or 64. and conſequent-"ly, that the Goſpel of St. *Mark* was not written before "this time, but between that and the martyrdom of this "Apoſtle and St. *Paul*, in the year of Chriſt 67. or 68." *New and full Method. Vol.* 3. *p.* 88.

and 67. or 68. when, according to his computation, *Peter* and *Paul* ſuffered martyrdom.

J. A. Fabricius (b) was for the year of Chriſt 63. the ninth of *Nero*.

Mill ſays, that *(c)* St. *Mark* publiſhed his Goſpel at *Rome* in the year of Chriſt 63. after that the Apoſtles *Peter* and *Paul* had been gone from thence, as *Irenaeus* ſays.

But here I beg leave to obſerve, that, probably, *Irenaeus* does not ſpeak of theſe two Apoſtles removal from *Rome*, but of their deceaſe. *Secondly*, Dr. *Mill* has no reaſon to ſuppoſe, that *Peter* was at *Rome*, during the time of *Paul*'s two years impriſonment there, eſpecially at the period of it. But there is a great deal of reaſon to think otherwiſe. For we have ſeveral epiſtles of St. *Paul*, writ near the end of that confinement, in which no notice is taken of *Peter*.

Baſnage,

(b) Bib. Gr. l. 4. *cap. v. Tom.* 3. *p.* 124. *et* 131.

(c) Poſt Pauli ac Petri ἔξοδον, ſeu diſceſſum ab urbe Roma. . . . *Marcus diſcipulus et interpres Petri, et ipſe quae a Petro annuntiata erant, perſcripta nobis tradidit.* Inquit Irenaeus . . . Scripſit igitur Marcus Evangelium, juxta Irenaeum, paullo poſt horum duorum Apoſtolorum diſceſſum a Roma, qui accidiſſe videtur anno aerae vulgaris LXIII. *Mill. Proleg. num.* 101.

Baſnage (d) cloſely following *Irenaeus*, ſays, *Mark*'s Goſpel was publiſhed in the year 66. after the deceaſe of *Peter* and *Paul:* whoſe martyrdoms, according to him, happened in *(e)* the year 65.

So that it has been of late the opinion of many learned men, of the beſt judgement in theſe matters, that St. *Mark*'s Goſpel was not publiſhed, till after the year of Chriſt 60. I readily aſſent to them ſo far. And as I am diſpoſed to place the martyrdoms of theſe two great Apoſtles at *Rome*, in the later part of the year 64. or in 65. it ſeems to me probable, that St. *Mark*'s Goſpel was compoſed in the year 64. or 65. and made public by him the firſt fair opportunity, ſoon afterwards, before the end of the year 65. That I mention as the lateſt date. I do not preſume to ſay the time exactly. For it might be finiſhed, and publiſhed in the year 64.

I hoped to have had aſſiſtance from Mr. *Wetſtein* in this diſquiſition. But have been ſome-

(d) De Marci Evangelio legimus apud Irenaeum . . . *Poſt vero horum exceſſum* . . . . Quae traditio magis apud nos valet, quam alia quaelibet de tempore editi a Marco Evangelii chronologia. *Baſn. ann.* 66. *n. xii.*

(e) Vid. ann. 65. *nnm. ix.*

ſomewhat diſappointed. In his preface to St. *Mark*'s Goſpel he concludes from Col. iv. 10. and Philem. ver. 23. that *(f)* St. *Mark* had been with the Apoſtle *Paul* at *Rome*, in the time of his confinement there: that from thence he went to *Coloſſe*, and afterwards returned to *Rome*, where he is ſaid to have writ his Goſpel. Accordingly, as one would think, St. *Mark*'s Goſpel could not be publiſhed before the year 64. or 65. But in his preface to St. *Luke*'s Goſpel the ſame learned writer expreſſeth himſelf to this purpoſe. " According *(g)* to ſome ec-
" cleſiaſtical writers *Luke* publiſhed his Goſ-
" pel fifteen, according to others two and
" twenty years after Chriſt's aſcenſion . . . .
" That he tranſcribed many things from
" *Matthew*, and yet more from *Mark*, is
" manifeſt."

But

(f) Inde Romam venit, Paulumque captivum inviſit. Col. iv. 10. Philem. 23. Inde ad Coloſſenſes abiit, a quibus rogatu Pauli Romam rediit. 2 Tim. iv. 11. ubi Evangelium conſcripſiſſe . . . . dicitur. *Wetſten. N. T. Tom. i. p.* 551.

(g) Evangelium autem edidit xv, aut ſecundum alios xxii. poſt Chriſti adſcenſionem annis. . . . . Lucam multa ex Matthaeo, ex Marco plura deſcripſiſſe, ex collatione patet. *Ib. p.* 643.

But if St. *Luke* wrote within two and twenty years after Chriſt's aſcenſion, and tranſcribed a great deal from St. *Mark*; St. *Mark*'s Goſpel muſt have been firſt publiſhed, and very early. If St. *Mark*'s Goſpel was not publiſhed, till the year 64. and St. *Luke* tranſcribed from him; St. *Luke* could not write, till a good while after two and twenty years from Chriſt's aſcenſion. I do not perceive therefore, that Mr. *Wetſtein* had any determined opinion concerning the date of theſe two Goſpels. Nor can I, as yet, perſuade myſelf, that any of the Evangeliſts tranſcribed each other.

Marks of Time in the Goſpel itſelf.

VII. I will now obſerve ſome characters of time in the Goſpel itſelf, like thoſe before taken notice of in St. *Matthew*.

1. From ch. vii. 14 .. 23. it appears, that St. *Mark* fully underſtood the ſpirituality of the doctrine of Chriſt, recommending righteouſneſſe and true holineſſe, without an obligation to Jewiſh ritual ordinances and appointments.

2. His hiſtorie of the *Greek* or Gentil woman, in the ſame chap. vii. 24 .. 30. who beſought Jeſus to heal her daughter, and obtained her requeſt, deſerves notice here.

3. The

3. The call of the Gentils, and the rejection of the Jews, as a People, are intimated in ch. xii. 1 . . 12. in the parable there recorded, of the Houſeholder, who planted a vineyard, and let it out to huſbandmen: to whom after a while he ſent ſervants, and then his ſon, to receive from them the fruit of the vineyard. But they abuſed the ſervants, and killed the ſon. It is added: *What therefore will the lord of the vineyard do? He will deſtroy the huſbandmen, and will let out the vineyard unto others.* And what follows.

4. In ch. xiii. are predictions concerning the deſtruction of the temple, and the deſolations of the Jewiſh People. And, particularly, at ver. 14 . . 16. are remarkable expreſſions, intimating the near approach of thoſe calamities; and ſuited to excite the attention of ſuch as were in danger of being involved in them.

5. In his account of the inſtitution of the euchariſt our Lord ſays: ch. xiv. 24. *This is my bloud of the New Teſtament, which is ſhed for many:* that is, for all men, not for Jews only, but for Gentils alſo.

6. In ch. iv. 30 . . 32. is the parable of the *grain of muſtard ſeed, the leſt of all ſeeds, which*

which becometh greater than all herbs: repreſenting the ſwift and wonderful progreſſe of the goſpel in the world. Of which it is very likely, St. *Mark*, at the time of writing, had ſome knowledge.

7. It is manifeſt, that he well underſtood the extent of our Saviour's commiſſion to the twelve Apoſtles. For he has recorded it in theſe words, ch. xvi. 15. *Go ye therefore into all the world, and preach the goſpel to every creature*: or the whole creation, that is, Jews and Gentils, all mankind of every denomination.

8. Yea, it appears from the concluſion of his hiſtorie, that before he wrote, the Apoſtles (at leſt divers of them,) had left *Judea*, and had preached in many places. ver. 20. *And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, aud confirming the word with ſigns following.*

9. Ch. xvi. 18. *They ſhall take up ſerpents.* Some may think, that here is a reference to the hiſtorie, which we have in Acts xxviii. 3 . . 6. I do not ſay, there is. But allowing it, I ſhould not reckon it an objection to the genuinneſſe of this part of that chapter. It would only be an argument for the late date of this Goſpel. And it has been ſo underſtood

derſtood by *(h)* ſome. For my own part, I cannot ſay, that St. *Mark* has referred to it. But I make no queſtion, that he was acquainted with the event there related, when he wrote his Goſpel.

Obſervations upon this Goſpel.

VIII. I ſhall conclude this chapter with ſome obſervations upon St. *Mark*'s Goſpel.

1. It confirms the accounts given by the ancients, that it is the ſubſtance of *Peter*'s preaching.

This was taken notice of juſt now in our recollection. But I chooſe to enlarge upon it here, and ſhew, that the Goſpel itſelf affords evidences of it's being writ according to that Apoſtle's diſcourſes, or according to informations and directions given by him to this Evangeliſt.

1.) In the firſt place I would here remind my readers of a long paſſage of *Euſebius*, the learned

(h) Poſtremo, in ipſis Evangeliis quaedam exſtare videntur criteria, ex quibus ea ſero eſſe conſcripta colligi poteſt. Phraſis μέχρι τῆς σήμερον, *uſque ad hunc diem.* Mat. xxviii. 15. juſtum ſpatium inter Chriſti reſurrectionem et Evangelium exaratum poſtulare videtur. Ita quae Marcus cap. xvi. 18. de *ſerpentibus* a Chriſti diſcipulis ſine damno tollendis habet, ad Paulum, Romam tendentem, et quod ei in itinere in inſula Mileto contigit, reſpicere videntur. *Herman. Venema Diſſ. ſecund. de titulo ep. ad Epheſ. Cap. v. num. iv.*

learned Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, formerly tranſcribed, of which I take here a very ſmall part only.

Having obſerved ſeveral things very honorable to *Peter*, related in the other Goſpels, he adds: "Though *(i)* ſuch things "were ſaid to *Peter* by Jeſus, *Mark* has "taken no notice of them: becauſe, as is "probable, *Peter* did not relate them in "his ſermons. For he did not think fit "to bear teſtimonie to himſelf by relating "what Jeſus ſaid to him, or of him. There-"fore *Mark* has omitted them. But what "concerned his denial of Jeſus, he preached "to all men, becauſe he wept bitterly.... "For all things in *Mark* are ſaid to be me-"moirs of *Peter*'s diſcourſes."

2.) And *(k) Chryſoſtom*, reconciling *Matthew*'s and *Mark*'s accounts of *Peter*'s denying Chriſt, ſays: "Theſe things *Mark* "had from his maſter. For he was a diſ-"ciple of *Peter*. And what is very re-"markable, though he was a diſciple of "*Peter*, he relates his fall more particularly, "than any of the reſt."

(i) Vol. viii. p. 86.... 88.
(k) Vol. x. p. 318.

3.) The *(l)* ſame great preacher explaining the hiſtorie of our Lord's paying the didrachm or tribute-money to the temple, which is in Matth. xvii. 24. . . 27. and particularly thoſe words: *That take, and give unto them for me and thee*, ſays, "*Mark*, who was a diſciple of "*Peter*, omits this, becauſe it was honorable "to that Apoſtle. But he relates the hiſtorie "of his denial of Chriſt. And perhaps his "maſter forbid him to inſert ſuch things, as "tended to aggrandiſe him."

4.) No one has more largely treated this point, than Mr. *Jones*, who has *(m)* a catalogue of ſeveral places in the Goſpels, containing things tending to *Peter*'s honour, which are not mentioned in St. *Mark*'s Goſpel.

(1.) The account of Chriſt's pronouncing *Peter* bleſſed, when he had confeſſed him: Chriſt's declaring, that he had his faith and knowledge from God: the promiſe of the keys, and of that large power, which is made to him: are omitted by St. *Mark*, though the former and the ſucceding parts of this diſcourſe are both told by him. See Matt. xvi. 16. . . 20. compared with Mark viii. 29. 30.

(2.) The

(l) P. 319.

(m) *See new and full Method. Part* 3. *p.* 79. . . 81.

(2.) The relation of St. *Peter*'s being commiſſioned by Chriſt to work the miracle, by getting money out of the fiſh's mouth, to pay the tribute-money, is told by St. *Matthew*. ch. xvii. 24. . . 28. but omitted by St. *Mark*: though the preceding and ſubſequent ſtories are the very ſame as in St. *Matthew*. See Mark ix. 30. . . 33.

(3.) Chriſt's particular expreſſions of love and favour to St. *Peter*, in telling him of his danger, and that he prayed particularly for him, that his faith might not fail, is omitted by St. *Mark*, but related *Luke* xxii. 31. 32.

(4.) St. *Peter*'s remarkable humility above the reſt of the Apoſtles expreſſed in an unwillingneſſe, that Chriſt ſhould waſh his feet, which none of the reſt did expreſs, with Chriſt's particular diſcourſe to him. *John* xiii. 6. &c. is omitted by *Mark*.

(5.) The inſtance of St. *Peter*'s very great zeal for Chriſt, when he was taken, in cutting off the High-Prieſt's ſervant's ear. John xviii. 10. is not mentioned by *Mark* in particular, but only told in general, of a certain perſon that ſtood by. Mark xiv. 47.

(6.) St. *Peter*'s faith in caſting himſelf into

the ſea, to go to Chriſt. John xxi. 7. is not mentioned by St. *Mark*. (A)

(7.) Chriſt's diſcourſe with Peter concerning his love to him, and his particular repeated charge to him, to feed his ſheep. John xxi. 15. is omitted by St. *Mark*.

(8.) Our Saviour's predicting to *Peter* his martyrdom, and the manner of it. John xxi. 18. 19. is not related by St. *Mark*.

"Theſe, adds that diligent author, are ſome inſtances of things, tending to St. *Peter*'s honour, recorded by the other Evangeliſts, none of which are ſo much as hinted by St. *Mark*. . . . All which cannot be accounted for any way more probable, than ſuppoſing, that this Apoſtle did not publiſh thoſe circumſtances, which were ſo much to his honour."

Indeed, I think, they do confirm the accounts given of this Goſpel by the ancients. For theſe omiſſions cannot be ſo well aſcribed to any thing, as to St. *Peter*'s modeſtie and reſervedneſſe, who had not mentioned ſuch things in his preaching, and diſcouraged the putting them down in writing: inſomuch, that

(A) There is a like thing, and more extraordinarie, related by *Matthew* only. ch. xiv. 28. . . 31. I do not know, why Mr. *Jones* omitted it.

that as *Tertullian* ſays, the *(n)* Goſpel publiſhed by *Mark*, may be ſaid to be *Peter*'s.

5.) Nevertheleſs I muſt acknowledge, that there are ſome things in St. *Mark*'s Goſpel honorable to *Peter*, which are not in any other. I ſhall mention two or three.

Says St. *Mark* ch. i. 36. *And Simon, and they that were with him, followed after him.* If thereby be intended the whole companie of the Apoſtles, that way of deſcribing them is very honorable to *Peter*. But ſome may ſuppoſe, none to be intended, beſide thoſe mentioned ver. 29. If ſo, it reſembles Luke ix. 32. *But Peter, and they that were with him:* meaning *John* and *James*, and referring to ver. 28.

In Mark xiv. 3. *Peter* is mentioned, as one of the four Apoſtles, to whom our Lord addreſſed himſelf, when he foretold the deſtruction of the temple, and the calamities attending it. Which is a paſſage peculiar to St. *Mark*.

And Ch. xvi. 7. The meſſage, which the angels ſent to the diſciples by the women at the ſepulchre, is thus expreſſed: *But go your way. Tell his diſciples, and Peter, that he goes before you into Galilee. Peter* is not mentioned,

(n) See Vol. ii. p. 581.

tioned, upon this occaſion, by *Matthew* xxviii. 7. nor by any other of the Evangeliſts.

Upon this text *Whitby* ſays very well: "*Peter* is here named, not as Prince of the "Apoſtles, but, as the Fathers ſay, for his "conſolation, and to take off the ſcruple, "which might be upon his ſpirit: whether "by his threefold denial of his maſter, he "had not forfeited his right to be one of "Chriſt's diſciples."

I now proceed to another obſervation.

2. St. *Mark*'s Goſpel, as is evident to all, is the ſhorteſt of the four. *Jerome*, as before cited, ſays, Mark *(o)* wrote a ſhort Goſpel. And *Chryſoſtom* obſerved, that *(p) Mark* had the conciſeneſſe of *Peter*, following his maſter.

3. Nevertheleſs there are in St. *Mark* many things peculiar to himſelf, not mentioned by any other Evangeliſt.

I ſhall here put down ſeveral ſuch things, and not thoſe, which are omitted by *Matthew* only, but ſuch things, as are in *Mark*, and in no other of the Evangeliſts.

1.) In the account of our Saviour's temptation in the wilderneſſe, St. *Mark* ſays, ch. i. 13. *and was with the wild beaſts:* not mentioned

(o) See here. p. 175. *(p) See Volume x. p.* 322.

tioned by any other Evangeliſt, and yet very proper to ſhew the hardſhips, which our Lord underwent at that ſeaſon.

2.) Ch. i. 20. In the account of the call of *James* and *John*, the ſons of *Zebedee*, he ſays, *they left their father in the ſhip, with the hired ſervants.* A circumſtance not mentioned by any other.

3.) Ch. i. 29. *And forthwith, when they were come out of the ſynagogue, they entred into the houſe of Simon, and Andrew, with James and John.* In Matt. viii. 14. it is only, *come into Peter's houſe.* In Luke iv. 38. *and entred into Simon's houſe.*

4.) Ch. i. 33. *And all the city was gathered together at the door.* Not in any other Evangeliſt. Compare Matt. viii. 16. Luke iv. 40. 41.

5.) Ch. i. 35. *And in the morning riſing up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a ſolitarie place, and there prayed.* 36. *And Simon, and they that were with him, followed after him.* 37. *And when they had found him, they ſaid unto him: All men ſeek thee.* This is not at all in *Matthew*, and is here much fuller, and with more particulars, than in Luke iv. 42.

6.) Ch. i. 45. Of the leper, cured by our Saviour, he ſays: *But he went out, and began to publiſh it much, and to blaze abroad the matter.* Not particularly mentioned by the other Evangeliſts. Compare Matth. viii. 4. Luke v. 14. 15.

7.) In the cure of the paralytic. ch. ii. 2. *And ſtraitway many were gathered together, inſomuch that there was no room to receive them, not ſo much as about the door.* 3. *And they come unto him, bringing one ſick of the palſie, which was born of four.* 4. *And —— they uncovered the roof.* . . No other Evangeliſt has ſo particularly deſcribed the croud. In *Mark* only is it ſaid, that this ſick man was *born of four.* He likewiſe more particularly deſcribes the uncovering the roof. Compare Matt. ix. 1. 2. Luke v. 18. 19.

8.) In the hiſtorie of the man with *a withered hand*, cured in the ſynagogue, on a ſabbath. ch. iii. 5. *And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardneſſe of their hearts, he ſaith unto the man: Stretch forth thy hand.* Not ſo full in any other Evangeliſt. Compare Matt. xii. 9. . . 13. Luke vi. 6. . . 11.

9.) Ch. iii. ver. 6. *And the Phariſees went forth, and ſtraitway took counſel with the Herodians*

rodians againſt him. Matt. xii. 14. mentions *Phariſees* only. Luke vi. 11. mentions no perſons by name.

10.) Ch. iii. 17. *And James the ſon of Zebedee, and John the brother of James. And he named them Boanerges.* Not in any other Evangeliſt.

11.) Ch. iii. 19. . . *And they went into the houſe.* 20. *And the multitude cometh together again, ſo that they could not ſo much as eat bread.* 21. *And when his friends heard of it, they went out to lay hold of him. For they ſaid: He is beſide himſelf.* Whether that expreſſion *he is beſide himſelf*, is to be underſtood of Chriſt, or of the multitude, this paſſage is peculiar to St. *Mark.*

12.) Ch. iv. 26. *And he ſaid: So is the kingdom of God, as if a man ſhould caſt his ſeed into the ground,* 27. *and ſhould ſleep, and riſe night and day, and the ſeed ſhould ſpring and grow up, he knoweth not how.* 28. *For the earth bringeth forth fruit of itſelf, firſt the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.* 29. *But when the fruit is ripe, immediatly he putteth in the ſickle, becauſe the harveſt is come.* This parable is peculiar to St. *Mark.* See *Whitby* upon the place, and likewiſe *(q) Grotius.*

13.)

(q) Haec parabola, aliis omiſſa, cum ſuam hic explicationem

13.) After the parable of the grain of muſtard-ſeed, beſide other things common to him and *Matthew*, he adds. ch. iv. 24. *And when they were alone, he expounded all things to his diſciples.* Compare Matt. xiii. 31. . . 34. This particular leads us mightily, to think, that either *Mark* was an eye-witneſſe, or had the beſt and fulleſt information of things.

14.) Mark iv. 36. *And when they had ſent away the multitude, they took him even as he was in the ſhip.* This circumſtance, peculiar to St. *Mark*, enables us to account for our Lord's faſt ſleep in his paſſage to the countrey of the *Gadarens*. We perceive from St. *Mark*, that this voyage was undertaken in the evening, after the fatigue of long diſcourſes in public, and without any refreſhment. Our Lord's ſleep in the midſt of a ſtorm is mentioned by all three Evangeliſts. Matt. viii. 24. . . 26. Mark iv. 37. 38. Luke viii. 23. 24. But this Evangeliſt alone leads us to diſcern the occaſion of it.

15.) Farther, in the ſame ver. 36. of ch. iv. *And there were alſo with him ſeveral other little ſhips.* A particular, peculiar to St. *Mark*.

16.) Ch.

nem non habeat, explicari debet ex ſimili comparatione, quae eſt apud Matth. xiii. 24. *Grot. ad Marc. iv.* 26.

16.) And in the account of this voyage croſs the ſea, he ſays ver. 38. that our Lord was *in the hinder part of the ſhip, aſleep on a pillow:* two circumſtances, wanting in the other Evangeliſts.

17.) Certainly, theſe, and other things, are ſufficient to aſſure us, that either *Mark* was an eye-witneſſe: or, that he wrote things, as related to him by an eye-witneſſe, even *Peter* himſelf, as all the ancients ſay.

18.) In Matt. viii. 28. . . 34. Mark v. 1. . . 19. Luke viii. 26. . . 39. are the ſeveral accounts of our Lord's healing the demoniac, or demoniacs, in the countrey of the *Gadarens.* For *Matthew* ſpeaks of two, *Mark* and *Luke* of one only. In St. *Mark*'s hiſtorie are divers things, not in the other Goſpels. In him alone it is ſaid, that *the man was always night and day in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himſelf with ſtones.* And he only mentions the number of ſwine, that periſhed in the ſea, ſaying, *they were about two thouſand.*

19.) All the firſt three Evangeliſts have given a hiſtorie of our Lord's raiſing the daughter of *Jairus*, and healing the woman with an iſſue of bloud, both in connexion. Matt. ix. 18. . . 26. Mark v. 22. . . 43.

Luke

Luke viii. 41. . . 56. St. *Mark* has ſeveral things, which are in neither of the other. Of the woman he ſays ver. 26. *ſhe had ſuffered much of many Phyſicians . . . and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worſe.* At ver. 29. *And ſhe felt in her body, that ſhe was healed of that plague.* At ver. 41. he inſerts the very words, which Jeſus ſpake, when he raiſed the daughter of *Jairus: Talitha Kumi.* I have omitted ſome other things, peculiar to St. *Mark* in the account of theſe two miracles.

20.) Ch. vi. 13. In the account of the commiſſion given to the twelve by Chriſt in his life-time, he ſays: *they anointed many with oyl, and healed them.* Which is mentioned by no other Evangeliſt, as was obſerved of old by *(r) Victor.*

21.) Mark vii. 2. 3. 4. What is there ſaid of the Jews waſhing themſelves, when they come from the market, before they eat: and of their *cleanſing cups, pots, braſen veſſels, and tables,* is peculiar to St. *Mark.* Comp. Matt. xv. 1. 2.

22.) Ch. vii. 21. 22. Are the things, that defile men. St. Matthew, ch. xv. 19. mentions ſeven things only. St. Mark has thirteen.

(r) *See Vol. xi. p. 34.*

teen. And two of them, *an evil eye*, and *fooliſhneſſe*, are very ſingular.

23.) Ch. vii. 31. . . 37. Our Lord beſtows hearing and ſpeech upon a deaf and dumb man.

24.) Ch. viii. 22. . . 26. Our Lord cures a blind man at *Bethſaida*.

Theſe two miracles are peculiar to St. *Mark*, being related by no other Evangeliſt.

25.) Ch. x. 46. . . 52. is the account of the miracle on the blind man near *Jericho*. St. Mark, ver. 46. calls him blind *Bartimeus, ſon of Timaeus*. Not mentioned by the other Evangeliſts. See Matt. xx. 29. . . 34. Luke xviii. 35. . . 43. And at ver. 50. *he caſting away his garment, roſe, and came to Jeſus*. A circumſtance peculiar to St. *Mark*. Which ſhews his exact knowledge of the hiſtorie, as did likewiſe his calling the man by his name.

26.) Ch. xi. 13. *For the time of figs was not yet*: that is, the time of gathering was not yet come. A moſt uſeful obſervation peculiar to this Evangeliſt, ſhewing, that as there were leaves, it was reaſonable to expect fruit on this fig-tree, if it was not barren. Upon this text might be conſulted *(s)* Biſhop *Kidder*, and *(t)* Mr. *Hallet*.

27.) Ch.

(s) Demonſtration of the Meſſiah. Part 2. ch. ii. p. 38. 39.

(t) Notes and Diſcourſes. Vol. 2. p. 114. . . 125.

27.) Ch. xiii. 3. 4. *And as he ſat upon the mount of Olives, over againſt the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, aſked him privatly . . . When ſhall theſe things be?* No other Evangeliſt has mentioned the names of the diſciples, who put this queſtion to our Saviour. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 1. . . 3. Luke xxi. 5.

28.) In Mark xii. 41. . . 44. and Luke xxi. 1. . . 4. is the account of the people caſting their gifts into the cheſts of the treaſurie, in the temple. St. *Mark* ſays: *And Jeſus ſat over againſt the treaſurie.* In which expreſſion there is great propriety. And he alone mentions the value of the poor widow's two mites, ſaying: *Which make a farthing.*

29.) Ch. xiv. 51. *And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth caſt about his naked body. And the young men* [the guards] *laid hold on him.* 52. *And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked.* A particular, in no other Evangeliſt, yet very fitly taken notice of, as intimating the uſual noiſe and diſturbance, when a man is taken up in the night-time, as a malefactor, and is carried before a magiſtrate. By *(u)* the

(u) Non de Apoſtolorum grege . . . ſed ex villa aliqua horto proxima,

the noiſe of the people paſſing along that young perſon was excited to come haſtily out of the houſe, where he was, to inquire, what was the matter. Mr. *Le Clerc*, in his French Teſtament, has an uſeful note upon this place. He obſerves the natural ſimplicity of the Evangeliſts narration. Which, as he juſtly ſays, confirms the truth of their hiſtorie.

30.) Ch. xv. 21. *And they compell one Simon, a Cyrenian, who paſſed by, coming out of the countrey, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to bear his croſſe.* That particular, *the father of Alexander and Rufus*, is in no other Evangeliſt. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 32. and Luke xxiii. 26.

31.) Ch. xvi. 3. 4. *And they ſaid among themſelves: Who ſhall roll us away the ſtone from the door of the ſepulchre. For it was very great.* In no other Evangeliſt.

32.) Ch. xvi. 7. *But go your way. Tell his diſciples, and Peter, that he goes before you into Galilee.* The mention of *Peter* is peculiar to St. *Mark*. For in Matt. xxviii. 7. it is: *Go quickly, and tell his diſciples.* St. *Luke* has not recorded that meſſage.

33.) I

proxima, ſtrepitu militum excitatus, et ſubito accurrens, ut conſpiceret, quid ageretur. *Grot. ad Marc. xi.* 51.

33.) I add nothing more of this kind. I have omitted many things, which are in this Goſpel, and no other, being apprehenſive, that if I enlarged farther, I ſhould be charged with prolixity.

34.) The particulars that have been alleged, are ſufficient to aſſure us, that St. *Mark* is not an epitomiſer of another author: and that he was well acquainted with the things, of which he undertook to write a hiſtorie. He writes as an eye-witneſſe, or as one, who had full and authentic information at the firſt hand. In a word, St. *Mark*'s Goſpel, though ſhort, is a very valuable, and maſterly performance.

4. It may be proper for me to add one thing more: That I ſuppoſe the twelve verſes at the end of the ſixteenth chapter to be a genuine part of this Goſpel. If any doubt of it, I would refer them for their ſatisfaction to Dr. *Mill*, and to the obſervations of *Grotius* at the begining of that chapter, and to *Beza* upon the ninth verſe. And for explaining thoſe twelve verſes, and reconciling them with the other Evangeliſts, I refer to *Grotius*, and other Commentators.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

St. Luke, Evangeliſt.

I. *His Hiſtorie from the N. T.* II. *Teſtimonies of ancient Chriſtian Writers to St. Luke, and his two Books, his Goſpel, and the Acts.* III. *Remarks upon thoſe Teſtimonies.* IV. *The Time of writing his Goſpel and the Acts.* V. *Internal Characters of Time in the Goſpel.* VI. *The Place, where it was writ.* VII. *A general recollection of St. Luke's Character.* VIII. *Obſervations upon his Goſpel.* IX. *Obſervations upon the Book of the Acts.*

His Hiſtorie from the N. T.

I. THE firſt time that we find any mention of St. *Luke* in the books of the New Teſtament is in his (A) own hiſtorie. Acts xvi. 10. 11. Whereby

(A) From ſome words in the *Cambridge* manuſcript Bp.

Whereby it appears, that he was in *Paul*'s companie at *Troas*, before the Apoſtle took ſhip-

Pearſon has argued, that *Luke* was in *Paul*'s companie from the year 43. Dein paragrat [Paulus] Phrygiam et Galatiam, et per Myſiam venit Troadem, ubi ſe illi comitem adjunxiſſe indicat Lucas xvi. 10. Qui antea etiam Antiochiae cum Paulo fuit, et jam eum Troade aſſecutus eſt: ut colligere licet ex Act. xi. 28. ubi Codex Cantabr. habet, συνεσραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν. Ab anno igitur 43. per octennium diſcipulus fuerat Antiochiae. *Annal. Paulin. p.* 10. But it is not ſafe to relye upon one manuſcript only, different from all others, and of no great authority. As Mr. *Tillemont* took notice of this obſervation of *Pearſon*, I tranſcribe his thoughts about it. Selon le manuſcrit de Cambrige S. Luc dit qu'il eſtoit avec S. Paul à Antioche, des l' an 43. ce que Pearſon a receu. Mais il ne ſeroit pas ſeur de fier à un manuſcrit different de tous les autres. Et quand cela ſe pourroit en quelques occaſions, ce ne ſeroit pas à l'égard du manuſcrit de Cambrige, qui eſt plein d'additions et alterations contraires au veritable texte de S. Luc. *Mem. Ec. T. 2. S. Luc. note iii.* Some may argue from theſe words, that *Luke* was a Gentil, converted by *Paul* at *Antioch.* And others might argue, that he is the ſame as *Lucius*, mentioned Acts xiii. 1. But I ſhould think it beſt for neither ſide to form an argument from this reading. Mr. *Wetſtein* has referred us to a place of St. *Auguſtin*, where this text is quoted very agreeably to the *Cambridge* manuſcript. In illis autem diebus deſcenderunt ab Jeroſolymis Prophetae Antiochiam. Congregatis autem nobis, ſurgens unus ex illis, nomine Agabus. &c. *De Serm. Dom. l. 2. c. 17.* But it is obſervable, that *Irenaeus l. 3. c. 14. init.* a more ancient writer, enumerating St. *Luke*'s journeys in St. *Paul*'s companie, begins at *Troas.* Acts xvi. 8....10. I preſume, it muſt be beſt to relye upon him, and the general conſent of all manuſcripts, except one, in the common reading.

ſhipping to go into *Macedonia:* in which voyage St. *Luke* was one of the companie. ver. 8. *And they paſſing by Myſia, came to Troas.* 9. *And a viſion appeared to Paul in the night. There ſtood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, ſaying: Come over into Macedonia, and help us.* 10. *And when he had ſeen the viſion, immediatly we endeavored to go into Macedonia, aſſuredly gathering, that the Lord had called us to preach the goſpel to them.* 11. *Therefore looſing from Troas, we came with a ſtrait courſe to Samothracia.*

In that journey St. *Paul* went from *Samothracia* to *Neapolis*, and thence to *Philippi*. 11. . . 17. So far St. *Luke* ſpeaks in the firſt perſon plural. But having finiſhed his account of the tranſactions at *Philippi*, which reaches to ver. 40. the laſt of that chapter: at the begining of the next ch. xvii. 1. he (B) changeth the perſon, and ſays: *Now when they had paſſed through Amphipolis, and Apol-*

 lonia,

(B) Nevertheleſs it is ſuppoſed by many, that *Luke* continued with *Paul. Irenaeus* calls him *Paul*'s inſeparable companion, after his coming to be with the Apoſtle at *Troas. Adv. H. l.* 3. *c.* 14. So likewiſe *Cave.* Cujus perinde ſectator erat, et omnis peregrinationis comes. *H. L. T. i. p.* 25. *See alſo Tillem. St. Luc. Mem. Ec. T.* 2.

lonia, they came to Theſſalonica, where was a ſynagogue of the Jews.

Nor does he any more expreſſly ſpeak of himſelf, untill *Paul* was a ſecond time in *Greece*, and was ſetting out for *Jeruſalem* with the collections, which had been made for the poor ſaints in *Judea*, Acts xx. 1. . . 6. *And after the uproar* [at Epheſus,] *was ceaſed, Paul called unto him the diſciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over thoſe parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece, and there abode three months. And when the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to ſail into Syria, he purpoſed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Aſia Sopater, of Berea. . . Theſe going before, tarried for us at Troas. And we ſailed away from Philippi . . . and came unto them at Troas in five days, where we abode ſeven days.* So that *Luke* accompanied *Paul*, at that time, from *Greece* through *Macedonia* to *Philippi*, and alſo went with him from thence to *Troas*.

And it appears from the ſequel of the hiſtorie in the Acts, that *Luke* was one of thoſe, who accompanied the Apoſtle to *Jeruſalem*, and ſtaid with him there. And when the

Apoſtle

Apoſtle was ſent a priſoner from *Ceſarea* to *Rome*, he was in the ſame ſhip with him, and ſtaid with him at *Rome* during the whole time of his two years impriſonment there, with which the hiſtorie of the Acts concludes.

From St. *Paul*'s epiſtles writ at *Rome*, in the time of that confinement, we have proofs of *Luke*'s being with him. He is mentioned as with the Apoſtle. 2 Tim. iv. 11. an epiſtle writ, as I ſuppoſe, in the ſummer, after the Apoſtle's arrival there. In Philem. ver. 24. he is one of thoſe, who ſend ſalutations to *Philemon*, and is mentioned by the Apoſtle, as one of his fellow-laborers. And, if *Luke the beloved Phyſician*, mentioned Col. iv. 14. be the Evangeliſt, that is another proof of his being then with the Apoſtle.

St. *Luke* is alſo ſuppoſed by ſome to be *the brother, whoſe praiſe is in the Goſpel throughout all the churches.* 2 Cor. viii. 18. But that is not certain.

As I think, that all St. *Paul*'s epiſtles, which we have, were writ, before he left *Rome* and *Italie*, when he had been ſent thither by *Feſtus*; I muſt be of opinion, that the New Teſtament affords us not any materials for the hiſtorie of St. *Luke*, lower than his own book

of the Acts, which brings us down to the end of that period.

From ancient authors.

II. I now therefore proceed without farther delay, to obſerve what light may be obtained from ancient Chriſtian writers. And as St. *Luke*'s two books, his Goſpel and the Acts, were all along univerſally received; I intend here, for avoiding prolixity, to allege, chiefly, ſuch paſſages only, as contain ſomething, relating to the hiſtorie and character of St. *Luke*, or the time of writing his two above-named works.

Irenaeus, as before quoted: "And *(a)* "*Luke*, the companion of *Paul*, put down "in a book the Goſpel preached by him." And the coherence ſeems to imply, that this was done after the writing of St. *Mark*'s Goſpel, and after the death of *Peter* and *Paul*. In a paſſage formerly cited *(b)* at length, *Irenaeus* ſhews from the Acts, as we did juſt now, that *Luke* attended *Paul* in ſeveral of his journeys and voyages, and was his fellow-laborer in the goſpel. He likewiſe ſays: "that *(c)* *Luke* was not only a companion, but "alſo a fellow-laborer of the Apoſtles, eſpe-"cially of *Paul*." Again, he calls him "a

(a) *Vol. i. p.* 354. *(b)* *P.* 361... 363.
(c) *P.* 363.

" a (*d*) diſciple and follower of the Apoſtles."
" The *(e)* Apoſtles, he ſays, envying none
" plainly delivered to all the things which
" they had learned from the Lord. So like-
" wiſe *Luke*, envying no man, has delivered
" to us what he learned from them, as he
" ſays: *Even as they delivered them unto us,*
" *who from the begining were eye-witneſſes and*
" *miniſters of the word.*"

By all which it ſeems, that *Irenaeus* reckoned *Luke* to have been a diſciple of the Apoſtles, not a hearer of Jeſus Chriſt himſelf.

Clement of *Alexandria* has bore a large teſtimonie to this Goſpel, and the Acts, as well as to the other books of the New Teſtament. And as we learn from *Euſebe*, " in *(f)* his
" Inſtitutions, he mentions a tradition con-
" cerning the order of the Goſpels, which he
" had received from Preſbyters of more an-
" cient times, and which is to this purpoſe.
" He ſays, that the Goſpels containing the ge-

 nealogies

(*d*) *P.* 361.

(*e*) Sic Apoſtoli ſimpliciter nemini invidentes quae didicerant ipſi a Domino haec omnibus tradebant. Sic igitur et Lucas nemini invidens, ea quae ab eis didicerat, tradidit nobis, ſicut ipſe teſtatur dicens: Quemadmodum tradiderunt nobis qui ab initio contemplatores et miniſtri fuerunt verbi. *Adv. H. l.* 3. *cap.* 14. *n.* 2.

(*f*) *Vol. ii. p.* 475.

" nealogies were writ firſt:" According to that tradition therefore St. *Matthew*'s and St. *Luke*'s Goſpels were writ before St. *Mark*'s. Which, according to the ſame *Clement*, and the tradition received by him, was writ at *Rome*, at the requeſt of St. *Peter*'s hearers, or the Chriſtians in that city.

Tertullian (g) ſpeaks of *Matthew* and *John*, as diſciples of Chriſt, of *Mark* and *Luke*, as diſciples of Apoſtles. Therefore, I think, he did not reckon theſe to have been of the ſeventy, or hearers of Chriſt. However, he aſcribes a like authority to theſe, and ſays: " that *(h)* the Goſpel, which *Mark* publiſh-" ed, may be ſaid to be *Peter*'s, whoſe inter-" preter *Mark* was. For *Luke*'s Digeſt alſo " is often aſcribed to *Paul*. And indeed it " is eaſie to take that for the maſters, which " the diſciples publiſhed." Again: " more-" over *(i) Luke* was not an Apoſtle, but apoſ-" tolical: not a maſter, but a diſciple: cer-" tainly leſs than his maſter, certainly ſo much " later, as he is a follower of *Paul*, the laſt of " the Apoſtles." This likewiſe ſhews *Tertullian*'s notion of St. *Luke*'s character.

Origen

(g) Vol. ii. p. 587. 588. *(h) P.* 581.
(i) P. 587.

Origen mentions the Goſpels in the order now generally received. " The *(k)* third, " ſays he, is that according to *Luke*, the Goſ- " pel commended by *Paul*, publiſhed for the " ſake of the Gentil converts." In his Commentarie upon the epiſtle to the *Romans*, which we now have in a *Latin* verſion only, he ſays, upon ch. xvi. 21. " Some *(l)* ſay, " *Lucius* is *Lucas* the Evangeliſt, as indeed it " is not uncommon to write names ſome- " times according to the original form, ſome- " times according to the Greek or Roman " termination." *Lucius*, mentioned in that text of the epiſtle to the *Romans*, muſt have been a Jew. Nevertheleſs, as *Origen* aſſures us, ſome thought him to be *Luke* the Evangeliſt. The ſame obſervation we ſaw in *(m) Sedulius*, who wrote a Commentarie upon St. *Paul*'s epiſtles, collected out of *Origen*, and others.

Euſebius of *Ceſarea*, as tranſcribed formerly, ſpeaking of St. *Paul*'s fellow-laborers, ſays:

(k) Vol. iii. p. 235.

(l) Sed et Lucium quidam perhibent eſſe Lucam Evangeliſtam, qui Evangelium ſcripſit, pro eo quod ſoleant nomina interdum ſecundum patriam declinationem, interdum Graecam Romanamque proferri. *In Rom. T.* 2. *p.* 632. *Baſil.* 1571.

(m) Vol. xi. p. 182.

ſays: "And *(n) Luke*, who was of *Antioch*, "and by profeſſion a Phyſician, for the moſt "part a companion of *Paul*, who had likewiſe more than a ſlight acquaintance with "the reſt of the Apoſtles, has left us in two "books, divinely inſpired, evidences of the "art of healing ſouls, which he had learned "from them. One of theſe is the Goſpel, "which he profeſſeth to have writ, as *they* "*delivered* it to him, *who from the begining* "*were eye-witneſſes and miniſters of the word:* "with all whom, he ſays likewiſe, he had "been *perfectly acquainted from the very firſt.* "The other is the Acts of the Apoſtles, "which he compoſed now, not from what "he had received by the report of others, "but from what he had ſeen with his own "eyes."

And in another place, cited *(o)* alſo formerly, he obſerves, "that *(p) Luke* had de"livered in his Goſpel a certain account of "ſuch things, as he had been well aſſured of "by his intimate acquaintance and familiarity "with

(n) Vol. viii. p. 103. 104. *(o) P.* 95.

(p) . . . Τὸν ἀσφαλῆ λόγον ὧν αὐτὸς ἱκανῶς τὴν ἀλήθειαν κατειλήφει, ἐκ τῆς ἅμα παύλῳ συνουσίας τε καὶ διατριβῆς, καὶ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων ὁμιλίας ὠφελήμενος, διὰ τε ἰδίᾳ παρέδωκεν εὐαγγελίᾳ. *H. E. l.* 3. *c.* 24. *p.* 96. *c.*

" with *Paul*, and his converſation with the " other Apoſtles."

From all which, I think, it appears, that *Euſebe* did not take *Luke* for a diſciple of Chriſt, but of Apoſtles only.

In the Synopſis aſcribed to *Athanaſius* it is ſaid, " that *(q)* the Goſpel of *Luke* was dic- " tated by the Apoſtle *Paul*, and writ and " publiſhed by the bleſſed Apoſtle and Phy- " ſician *Luke*."

The author of the Dialogue againſt the *Marcionites* ſays, " that *(r) Mark* and *Luke* were diſciples of Chriſt, and of the number of the Seventy."

Epiphanius (s) ſpeaks to the like purpoſe.

Gregorie Nazianzen ſays, " that *(t) Luke* wrote for the Greeks," or in *Achaia*.

Gregorie Nyſſen ſays, " that *(u) Luke* was as much a Phyſician for the ſoul, as for the body:" taking him to be the ſame, that is mentioned Col. iv. 14.

In the catalogue of *Ebedjeſu* it is ſaid, " that *(x) Luke* taught and wrote at *Alex-* " *andria*, in the Greek language."

The

(q) Vol. viii. p. 250. *(r) P.* 255.
(s) P. 306. *(t) Vol. ix. p.* 133.
(u) P. 156. *(x) P.* 217.

The Author of the Commentarie upon St. *Paul*'s thirteen epiſtles ſeems to have doubted, whether *(y)* the Evangeliſt *Luke* be the perſon intended Col. iv. 14.

Jerome agrees very much with *Euſebe*, already tranſcribed. Nevertheleſs I ſhall put down here ſomewhat largely what he ſays. " *Luke (z)* a Phyſician of *Antioch*, not un- " ſkilfull in the *Greek* language, a diſciple of " the Apoſtle *Paul*, and the conſtant compa- " nion of his travels, wrote a Goſpel,—and " another excellent volume, entitled the Acts " of the Apoſtles.... It is ſuppoſed, that *Luke* " did not learn his Goſpel from the Apoſtle " *Paul* only, who had not converſed with the " Lord in the fleſh, but alſo from other A- " poſtles. Which likewiſe he owns at the " begining of his volume, ſaying: *Even as* " *they delivered them unto us, who from the* " *begining were eye-witneſſes and miniſters of* " *the word.* Therefore he wrote the Goſpel " from the information of others. But the " Acts he compoſed from his own know- " ledge."

So writes *Jerome* in his book of Illuſtrious Men.

In

(y) Vol. ix. p. 367. 368. *(z) Vol. x. p.* 94...96.

In the prologue to his Commentarie upon St. *Matthew* he ſays: "The *(a)* third Evan-
"geliſt is *Luke*, the Phyſician, a *Syrian* of
"*Antioch*, who was a diſciple of the Apoſtle
"*Paul*, and publiſhed his Goſpel in the coun-
"treys of *Achaia* and *Baeotia*."

He obſerves elſewhere, "that *(b)* ſome ſaid, *Luke* had been a proſelyte to Judaiſm, before his converſion to Chriſtianity." He ſpeaks of St. *Luke* in many other places, which I need not now take notice of.

Auguſtin ſays, "that *(c)* two of the Evangeliſts, *Matthew* and *John*, were Apoſtles... *Mark* and *Luke* diſciples of Apoſtles."

Chryſoſtom in the Synopſis, probably his, ſays: "Two *(d)* of the Goſpels were writ
"by *John* and *Matthew*, Chriſt's diſciples,
"the other two by *Luke* and *Mark*, of whom
"one was diſciple of *Peter*, the other of
"*Paul*. The former converſed with Chriſt,
"and were eye-witneſſes of what they wrote.
"The other two wrote what they had re-
"ceived from eye-witneſſes." And to the like purpoſe in *(e)* his firſt homilie upon St. *Matthew*. Again, he ſays: "*Luke (f)* had
"the

(a) P. 83. 84. *(b)* P. 97. *(c)* P. 227. 228.
(d) P. 312. *(e)* P. 314... 316. *And ſee p.* 325.
(f) P. 322.

" the fluence of *Paul*, *Mark* the conciſe-
" neſſe of *Peter*, both learning of their maſ-
" ters." And upon Col. iv. 14. he ſays: This *(g)* is the Evangeliſt.

Upon Col. iv. 14. *Theodoret* ſays, " this *(h)* perſon wrote the divine Goſpel, and the hiſtorie of the Acts." He ſays the ſame upon *(l)* 2 Tim. iv. 11.

Paulinus (m) celebrates *Luke*, as having been firſt a Phyſician of the body, then of the ſoul.

Here I would refer to the Author of Quaeſtiones et Reſponſiones, probably writ in the fifth centurie, who *(n)* reckons both the Evangeliſts, writers of the genealogies, that is, *Matthew* and *Luke*, to have been *Hebrews*.

According to *Euthalius (o) Luke* was a diſciple of *Paul*, and a Phyſician of *Antioch*.

Iſidore of *Seville*, ſays: " of *(p)* the four " Evangeliſts, the firſt and laſt relate what " they had heard Chriſt ſay, or had ſeen him " perform. The other two, placed between " them, relate thoſe things, which they had " learned from Apoſtles. *Matthew* wrote " his

(g) Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ εὐαγγελιστής. *In Col. hom.* 12. *T. xi. p.* 412.
(h) See Vol. xi. note (A). *(l) In* 2 *Tim. T.* 3. *p.* 505.
(m) Vol. xi. p. 44. *(n) See Vol. i. p.* 263.
(o) Vol. xi. p. 211. *(p) P.* 367.

" his Goſpel firſt in *Judea*. Then *Mark* in " *Italie*, *Luke*, the third, in *Achaia*, *John*, " the laſt, in *Aſia*." In another place he ſays: " Of *(q)* all the Evangeliſts *Luke*, the " third in order, is reckoned to have been the " moſt ſkilfull in the Greek tongue. For he " was a Phyſician, and wrote his Goſpel in " *Greece*."

In *Theophylact* are theſe things. In his preface to St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel he ſays, " that *(r)* there are four Evangeliſts, two of " which, *Matthew* and *John*, were of the " choir of the twelve Apoſtles: the other " two, *Mark* and *Luke*, were of the number " of the Seventy. *Mark* was a diſciple and " companion of *Peter*, *Luke* of *Paul*. . . . " *Luke* wrote fifteen years after Chriſt's aſ- " cenſion." In the preface to his Commentarie upon St. *Luke* he ſays, " that *(s)* from " that introduction it appears, *Luke* was not " from the begining a diſciple, but only af- " terwards. For others were diſciples from " the begining, as *Peter*, and the ſons of *Ze-* " *bedee*, who delivered to him the things " which they had ſeen or heard." Upon which ſome remarks were made by us in the place referred to. In his comment upon the

(q) P. 372. *(r)* P. 419. 420. *(s)* P. 422.

the hiſtorie of the two diſciples, whom Jeſus met in the way to *Emmaus*, one of whom is ſaid to be *Cleophas*. Luke xxiv. 18. *Theophylact* ſays: "Some *(t)* have thought the "other to be *Luke* the Evangeliſt, who out "of modeſtie declined to mention himſelf." In his preface to the Acts *Theophylact* ſays: "The *(u)* writer is *Luke*, native of *Antioch*, "by profeſſion a Phyſician."

Euthymius ſays: "*Luke (x)* was a native "of *Antioch*, and a Phyſician. He was a "hearer of Chriſt, and, as ſome ſay, one of "his ſeventy diſciples, as well as *Mark*. "He was afterwards very intimate with "*Paul*. He wrote his Goſpel, with *Paul*'s "permiſſion, fifteen years after our Lord's "aſcenſion."

So *Euthymius*. But I ſhould think, that very few, who ſuppoſed *Luke* to have been a native of *Antioch*, could likewiſe reckon him a hearer of Jeſus Chriſt. But *Euthymius*, as it ſeems, puts together every thing he had heard or read, without judgement or diſcrimination.

What *Nicephorus Calliſti* ſays, is, briefly, to this purpoſe. "Two *(y)* only of the "Twelve,

(t) P. 423. *(u)* P. 426. *(x)* P. 437. *(y)* P. 442.

" Twelve, *Matthew* and *John* left memoirs " of our Lord's life on earth : and two of " the Seventy, *Mark* and *Luke* . . *Matthew* " wrote about fifteen years after our Savi- " our's aſcenſion. Long after that *Mark* " and *Luke* publiſhed their Goſpels by the " direction of *Peter* and *Paul.* The ſame " *Luke* compoſed alſo the book of the Acts " of the Apoſtles."

To theſe authors I now add *Eutychius*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, in the tenth centurie, who ſays : " In *(z)* the time of the ſame Em- " perour, (that is, *Nero*,) *Luke* wrote his Goſ- " pel in Greek to a noble and wiſe man of " the *Romans*, whoſe name was *Theophilus* : " to whom alſo he wrote the Acts, or the " hiſtorie of the Diſciples. The Evangeliſt " *Luke* was a companion of the Apoſtle " *Paul*, going with him where-ever he went. " For which reaſon the Apoſtle *Paul* in one

(z) Etiam tempore hujus Imperatoris ſcripſit Lucas Evangelium ſuum Graece, ad virum nobilem ex ſapientibus Romanis, cui nomen Theophilus, ad quem item ſcripſit Acta ſeu Diſcipulorum hiſtoriam. Erat autem Lucas Evangeliſta comes Pauli Apoſtoli, quocumque per aliquod tempus manſit. Unde eſt, quod Paulus Apoſtolus in quadam epiſtola ſua dicit. Lucas Medicus vos ſalutat. *Eutych. Annal. p.* 335. 336.

" of his epiſtles ſays: *Luke, the Phyſician,* " *ſalutes you.*"

Remarks. III. Having thus recited the teſtimonies of all theſe writers concerning the Evangeliſt *Luke*, I ſhall now make ſome remarks.

1. We hence perceive, that the notion, that St. *Luke* was a Painter, is without foundation, no notice having been taken of it in theſe ancient writers. Indeed this is ſaid by one of our *(a)* authors, *Nicephorus Calliſti*, in the fourteenth centurie, from whom a paſſage was quoted in the way of a ſummarie concluſion. But we do not relye upon him for any thing not confirmed by other writers, more ancient, and of better credit. Nor is this account received by *(b) Tillemont*, or *(c) Du Pin*, but rejected by them, as altogether fabulous, eſpecially the later: though our Dr. *Cave (d)* was ſomewhat inclined to admit one

(a) .. ἄκρως δὲ τὴν ζωγράφην τέχνην ἐξεπισάμενος. *Niceph. l. 2. cap. 43. T. i. p. 210.*

(b) Saint Luc. Mem. Ec. T. 2.

(c) Nicephore et les nouveaux Grecs le font Peintre. Et il y a en differens endroits des images de la Vierge, qu'on donne pour l'ouvrage de S. Luc. Ce ſont des fictions, qui n'ont ni verité ni apparence. *Du Pin Diſſ. l. 2. ch. 2. §. 5.*

(d) Of more authority with me would be an ancient inſcription, found in a vault near the church of S. Mary in via

one teſtimonie to this affair, whilſt he rejected the reſt. For a farther account of St. *Luke*'s pretended pictures of the Virgin *Marie* I refer to *(e)* Mr. *Bower*.

2. We learn alſo, what judgement ought to be formed of the account given of St. *Luke* by *(f) Hugo Grotius*, and *(g) J. J. Wetſtein*:

via lata at Rome, ſuppoſed to be the place, where S. *Paul* dwelt: wherein mention is made of a picture of the B. Virgin. Una ex vii. a B. Lûca depictis: One of the ſeven painted by St. Luke. *Cave's Lives of the Apoſtles, in Engliſh, p.* 222.

(e) See his Lives of the Popes. Vol. 3. *p.* 205. 206.

(f) Noſtro autem nomen quidem Romanum fuiſſe arbitror, ſed aliquanto longius. . . . Quare et Lucas, ſi quid video, contractum eſt ex Romano nomine, quod ſuſpicor fuiſſe Lucillium. Nam ea gens tum Romae florebat. . . Erat noſter hic Syrus, ut veteres conſentiunt, et medicinam fecit. . . Syria autem multos Romanis ſervos exhibebat. Et medicina, ut ex Plinio atque aliis diſcimus, munus erat ſervile. Manumiſſi autem nomen patroni induebant, ut Comaediarum ſcriptor, Afer cum eſſet, dictus eſt a patrono Terentio Terentius. . . . Ita hic a Lucillio Lucillius, et contracte Lucas. Credibile eſt, cum Romae medicinam factitaſſet aliquamdiu, acceptâ libertate, rediiſſe in patriam. &c. *Grot. Pr. in S. Lucam.*

(g) Exercuiſſe medicinam Paulus ad Coloſſenſes teſtatur. Euſebius autem et Hieronymus addunt fuiſſe natione Syrum Antiochenum. . . . Interpretes porro conjectura probabili, tum ex nomine, tum ex arte quam profitebatur, colligunt, fuiſſe ſervum manumiſſum. Obſervant enim primo, nomen ejus in compendium fuiſſe redactum, ut pro Lucillio

vel

which is, that he was a *Syrian*, and a ſlave, either at *Rome*, or in *Greece:* and that having obtained his freedom, he returned to his native place, *Antioch:* where he became a Jewiſh Proſelyte, and then a Chriſtian. Which thoſe learned interpreters endeavor to make out in a ſomewhat different manner. But neither has alleged any ancient writer, ſaying, that the Evangeliſt *Luke* was once a ſlave, and afterwards became a free-man. Some ſlaves indeed were ſkilful in the art of medicine, and practiſed it in the families of their Roman maſters. But does it follow, that becauſe *Luke* was a Phyſician, that he was alſo a ſlave? This therefore being entirely deſtitute of foundation in antiquity muſt be eſteemed the fiction of ſome learned critic, who was much delighted with his own ingenious ſpeculations.

3. The account given of this Evangeliſt by *Euſebe*, and *Jerome* after him, that he was a *Syrian*,

vel Lucano vocaretur Lucas. . . . Obſervant ſecundo, ſervos et praecipue Syros medicinam factitaſſe. . . . Quod vero quidam exiſtimant, eum Romae ſerviiſſe, et a domino, qui ipſum manumiſerit, nomine Lucam appellatum fuiſſe, non ſatis certum videtur. Nam praeter familiam Lucilliam, quae Romana fuit, etiam Graecis illud nomen fuit impoſitum, ut ex Anthologia conſtat. *Wetſt. Pr. ad Luc. T. i. p.* 643.

Syrian, and native of *Antioch*, may be juſtly ſuſpected.

We do not find it in *Irenaeus*, nor *Clement* of *Alexandria*, nor *Tertullian*, nor *Origen*, nor in any other writer before *Euſebe*. Probably, therefore, it is not founded in any general, or well atteſted tradition: but was the invention of ſome conjectural critic, who having firſt imagined, out of his own head, that *Luke* was originally a Gentil, at length determined, that he was converted by *Paul* at *Antioch*. But all this was taken up without any good ground, or ſufficient authority. And *Luke* may have been a believer, before either *Paul* or *Barnabas* went to *Antioch*. The ſame Account is in *Jerome*. But he only follows *Euſebe*. He does not ſeem to have had any information about it from any others. Which is an argument, that there was not any early tradition to this purpoſe.

This ſtorie, I ſay, is in *Euſebe*, and *Jerome*, and ſome others, after them, but not in all ſucceding writers. Some of the ancients, as *Epiphanius*, and others, ſuppoſed *Luke* to have been one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples. Which is inconſiſtent with his being a native of *Antioch*. If any did not ſee this inconſiſtence, and allowed both, it muſt have been

owing to want of due attention and conſideration. And the ſuppoſition, made by ſome, that *Luke* was one of the Seventy, ſhews, that there was no prevailing, and well atteſted tradition, that he was a native of *Antioch*. For if there had been any ſuch tradition, it is not eaſie to conceive, how any ſhould have held the opinion, that he was one of the Seventy.

It was formerly obſerved, that *(h) Chryſoſtom* no where ſays in his remaining works, that *Luke* was of *Antioch*. Indeed, we *(i)* have loſt one of his homilies upon the title and begining of the Acts of the Apoſtles. Nevertheleſs it ſeems, that in ſome of his many homilies, ſtill remaining upon that book, or elſewhere, we ſhould have ſeen this particular, if it had been known to him. He takes notice, that *(k)* there might be ſeen in his time the houſe, in which *Paul* dwelled at *Antioch*. And he often ſpeaks of the prerogatives of that city, in his homilies preached there. Methinks, this alſo ſhould have been mentioned as one: that *Luke*, whom, (as is well known,) he often celebrates, was a native of that city. If this had been then known,

(h) Vol. x. p. 328. *(i) P.* 323.
(k) P. 371.

known, or generally believed, it is reaſonable to expect, that it ſhould have been frequently mentioned by *Chryſoſtom*, a native and Preſbyter of *Antioch*, who ſhined there as a Preacher twelve years. This has diſpoſed me to think, that in his time there was not at *Antioch* any prevailing tradition to this purpoſe.

Cave ſays, it *(l)* is likely, that *Luke* was converted by *Paul* at *Antioch*. *Mill (m)* ſays the ſame, rather more poſitively. Which may now be the opinion of many. I have gueſſed, that it might be the opinion of the perſon, who firſt gave riſe to the account, that *Luke* was a *Syrian*, of *Antioch*, mentioned in *Euſebe*. But I do not remember, that this is expreſſly ſaid by any of the ancient writers, out of whom I have made ſo large collections in the preceding volumes. And the thing is altogether unlikely. If *Luke* had been a Gentil, converted by *Paul*, he would have been always uncircumciſed, and unfit to accompany *Paul*, as he did. For the Apoſtle would

(l) . . . a D. Paulo, dum Antiochiae ageret, (uti veriſimile eſt) converſus. *Hiſt. Lit. T. i. p.* 25.

(m) Scriptor operi huic ſuſcipiendo, ſi quis unquam, ſumme idoneus : utpote qui ab ipſo tempore converſionis, quae contigit circa annum aerae vulgaris XLI. Ipſum enim ἑλληνιϛαῖϛ iſtis, qui magno numero Antiochiae converſi ſunt, [Act. xi. 20.] omnino adnumerârim. *Prol. n.* 112.

not have allowed the *Greeks*, or Gentils, of *Antioch*, or any other place, to receive that rite. Nor are there in the Acts, or *Paul*'s epiſtles, any hints, that *Luke* was his convert. Whereas, if he had been ſo, there (c) would have appeared ſome tokens of it in the affectionate expreſſions of *Paul* toward him, on the one hand, or in the reſpectful and grateful expreſſions of *Luke* toward *Paul*, on the other hand.

4. It has been reckoned doubtful by divers learned men, whether the Evangeliſt *Luke* was a Phyſician.

This particular is different from the foregoing. Nor has it any connexion with it. *Luke* may have been of *Antioch*, and not a Phyſician. He may have been a Phyſician, and not of *Antioch*. The queſtion is, whether *Luke*, *the beloved Phyſician*, mentioned by

(c) This thought occurred to Dr. *Whitby*, who in his preface to St. *Luke*'s Goſpel ſpeaks to this purpoſe: "We are "told, that *Luke* was converted by *Paul* at *Thebes*. *Anſwer.* "But this we have only from *Nicephorus*. And it is the leſs "credible, not only becauſe it comes to us ſo late: but alſo be- "cauſe it appears not from any credible author, that St. *Paul* "ever was there. It is more probable from the ſilence of St. "*Luke*, and St. *Paul*, who never calleth him his ſon, that he "was a Chriſtian, or a believer, long before."

by St. *Paul* Col. iv. 14. be the Evangeliſt. Divers of the ancients, as we have ſeen, have ſuppoſed him there intended. *Chryſoſtom*'s expreſſions are theſe: "This *(n)* is the E-"vangeliſt. But he does not diminiſh him "by naming him ſo late. He extols him, "as he does *Epaphras*. It is likely, that "there were others called by that name." This laſt particular, perhaps, may deſerve to be taken notice of. He affirms, that this is the Evangeliſt. But he ſuppoſeth, that there were others of the ſame name.

That diſtinguiſhing character, *beloved Phyſician*, not given to the Apoſtle's companion, and fellow laborer, in any other epiſtle, has induced divers learned and inquiſitive moderns, to doubt, whether one and the ſame perſon is intended. Among theſe are (*o*) *Calvin*,

(*n*) Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ εὐαγγελιστής . . εἰκὸς εἶναι καὶ ἄλλους καλουμένους τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ. *Chry. in Col. iv. hom.* 12. *T. xi. p.* 412.

(*o*) Non aſſentior iis, qui Lucam Evangeliſtam intelligunt. Nam et notiorem fuiſſe judico, quam ut opus fuerit tali indicatione, et ſplendidiore elogio fuiſſet inſignitus. Certe coadjutorem ſuum, aut fidum ſaltem comitem, et certaminum participem vocaſſet. Potius conjicio, hunc abfuiſſe, et alterum medici epitheto ab illo diſcerni. Quamquam non contendo, ut de re certa, ſed tamen conjecturas affero. *Calvin. in Col. iv.* 14.

vin, *(p) Sam. Baſnage*, *(q)* Dr. *Heumann*, whoſe obſervations and arguments I tranſcribe below. On the other hand *(r) Eſtius*, and (*s*) Mr. *Jones*, ſtrongly argue, that the ſame *Luke* is here intended, who is mentioned by St. *Paul* in ſome other epiſtles, even our Evangeliſt.

Upon

(p) Sunt tamen in Scripturâ Lucam Evangeliſtam a Luca Medico diſtinguendi cauſſae. &c. *Baſnag. Ann.* 60. *n. xxxiii.*

(q) Lucam Evangeliſtam fuiſſe Medicum, Hieronymus aliique probari poſſe credunt ex Col. iv. 14. Sed ex hoc ipſo loco confirmari poſſe puto contrarium. Si enim iſto loco Paulus innuiſſet comitem ſuum omnibus notum, Lucam Evangeliſtam, ſimpliciter vocaſſet Lucam, uti fecit. 2 Tim. iv. 11. At ut ſignificaret, ſe de alio luca loqui, diſcriminis cauſſa addit ὁ ἰατρός. *C. A. Heuman. Ep. Miſc. T.* 2. *p.* 518.

(r) Sunt qui in dubium revocent, num de Luca Evangeliſta loquatur Apoſtolus. Hunc enim dicunt notiorem fuiſſe, quam ut artis nomine eum deſignaret. Ac ſaltem, inquiunt, eum coadjutorem ſuum, aut fidelem comitem vocaſſet. Verum, ut vetus et communis, ita probatiſſima ſententia eſt. . . Lucam Evangeliſtam, Medicum fuiſſe, et eum ipſum, cujus hic mentio eſt: (neque enim alium Lucam Paulo familiarem ulla prodit hiſtoria:) Quod vero tacuit hoc loco adjutorem, id diſerte expreſſit ad Philemonem ſcribens, *Demas et Lucas adjutores mei*. Non enim putavit Apoſtolus rem ſatis notam ubique inculcandam eſſe. Ubi illud obſervandum eſt, Apoſtolum aſſidue Lucam cum Dema nominare, tam hoc loco, et ad Philemonem, quam etiam in ſecunda ad Tim. ep. cap. iv. Quis ergo dixerit, alium atque alium eſſe Lucam cum eodem Dema nominatum? *Com. in Col. iv.* 14.

(s) See Mr. Jones's New and Full Method. Vol. 3. *p.* 103. 104.

Upon the whole, it must be acknowledged, that this distinguishing character, *beloved Physician*, has occasioned a difficulty. Nevertheless, I would hope, that it is not insuperable. It is allowed, that in all other places of St. *Paul*'s epistles by *Luke* is intended the Evangelist. We know from the book of the Acts, that *Luke*, the writer of it, went with *Paul* to *Rome*, and staid with him to the end of his captivity there. Nor is there any reason to surmise, that at the time of writing this epistle he might be absent from the Apostle upon some special occasion. For he joyns in the salutations in the epistle to *Philemon*, of *Colosse*, sent at the same time with this epistle to the *Colossians*. Where also he is stiled a *fellow-laborer*. Philem. ver. 24. So that I cannot but think it probable, that *Luke*, the Evangelist, was by profession a Physician.

5. St. *Luke* was a Jew by birth, at least by religion.

None of the writers, out of whom we have made collections, call him a Gentil. Some, in *Jerome*'s time, whose names we do not know, said, *Luke* had been a Jewish Proselyte, that is, had been converted from Gentilism to Judaism, and afterwards became a Christian.

Chriſtian. But none, that I remember, expreſſly ſay, that he was converted from Gentiliſm to Chriſtianity. Unleſs we ſhould make an exception for *Nicephorus Calliſti*, who in one place ſays ſo. But he is too late, and of too little credit, to be much regarded: eſpecially, if he is ſingular. All our writers, who ſpeak of *Luke*, as a companion and diſciple of Apoſtles, muſt have ſuppoſed him to be a Jew. And ſome have ſaid, that he was one of the Seventy, as we have ſeen.

That *Luke* was a Jew by birth, or at leſt by religion, may be argued from his being a conſtant companion of *Paul* in many places, particularly, at *Jeruſalem*. If *Luke* had been an uncircumciſed Gentil, ſome exceptions would have been made to him. Nevertheleſs nothing of that kind appears either in St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, or in the Acts. Another thing leading to this ſuppoſition is his *(t)* following the Jewiſh computations of times: ſuch as the Paſſover, Pentecoſt, the Faſte. Of

(t) Quis vero cum veri ſpecie aliqua Lucam Evangeliſtam unum ex Judaeis fuiſſe neget? Lucam qui in deſignandis temporibus Judaeorum diſciplinam adhibet, Pentecoſtem ſcilicet, Jejunium, tertiam noctis vigiliam. Quae omnia ex Judaico more petuntur. *Baſnag. An.* 60. *n. xxxiii.*

Of all which inſtances may be ſeen in Acts xii. 3. xx. 6. and 16. xxvii. 9.

Here it will be objected, that *Luke the Phyſician*, mentioned Col. iv. 14. muſt have been a Gentil, becauſe at ver. 10. 11. the Apoſtle had mentioned *all thoſe of the circumciſion, who were his fellow-workers, and had been a comfort to him.* To which I anſwer. It is not certain, that *Luke*, the Evangeliſt, is the *beloved Phyſician*, there ſpoken of. We juſt now ſaw the reaſons of doubting about it. But there is another ſolution. St. *Paul (u)* needs not to be underſtood to ſpeak abſolutly. There might be ſeveral exceptions to that propoſition. *Timothie* was one, who joyns with the Apoſtle in ſending the epiſtle. But he and *Luke* were ſo well known to all, as faithful to the Apoſtle, that they needed not to be there mentioned. And *Luke* and *Demas* follow afterwards, ſomewhat lower, nearer the end of the epiſtle, very properly. ver. 14. *Luke, the beloved Phyſician, and Demas greet you.* And I ſhould be unwilling from this text, and the

(*u*) Adde, quod iſte ſermo, *hi ſoli*, non eſt ita rigide accipiendus, ut abſolute excludat omnes alios, ſed benigno ſenſu: Hi fere ſoli ſunt adjutores. *Eſt. ad iv. Col.* 11.

the coherence, to conclude, that *Demas* was a Gentil. Says the Apoſtle: Philem. ver. 24. *There ſalute thee Marcus, Ariſtarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-laborers.* The two firſt named were certainly Jews. I ſuppoſe, the other two were ſo likewiſe. Salutations from believers, of the Jewiſh People, would be very acceptable and encouraging to Gentil converts.

St. *Luke* ſays Acts i. 19. *inſomuch as that field was called in their proper tongue Aceldama.* Whence ſome may argue, that he was not a Jew. But it might be obſerved, that none of the Evangeliſts, when they ſpeak of the Jews, ſay any thing, to denote they were of that people. Says St. *Matthew* ch. xxviii. 15. *And this ſaying is commonly reported among the Jews untill this day.* Mark vii. 3. *For the Phariſees, and all the Jews, except they waſh their hands, eat not.* John i. 19. *The Jews ſent Prieſts and Levites from Jeruſalem.* ch. v. 1. *After this there was a feaſt of the Jews.* See alſo ch. xix. 40.—42. And does not St. *Paul* ſay 1 Theſſ. ii. 14. 15. *Ye became followers of the churches of God in Judea. For ye alſo have ſuffered like things of your own countrey-men, even as they of the Jews: who both killed the Lord Jeſus, and their own Prophets.*

phets. It might be not amiſs to obſerve alſo Acts xxviii. 17... 19. And I might refer to other places.

That this Evangeliſt was a Jew, is the opinion of many learned and judicious moderns: particularly, Mr. *S. Baſnage*, whom I have cited at note *(t)* and *J. A. Fabricius*, who *(x)* likewiſe is clearly of the ſame opinion. Indeed, I think, it ought not to be queſtioned.

6. *Luke*, the Evangeliſt, was, probably, an early Jewiſh believer, ſoon after Chriſt's aſcenſion, if not a hearer of Chriſt, and one of the ſeventy diſciples.

Our moſt ancient writers, as we have ſeen, ſpeak of *Luke* as a diſciple of the Apoſtles. Some have reckoned him one of the Seventy, others have thought him to be *Lucius*, mentioned by St. *Paul* in the epiſtle to the *Romans*, and others have ſuppoſed, that he was one

(x) Lucas, ſive Lucius,... incertum, num idem cum Luca Medico Col. iv. 14. quin Judaeus fuerit, at antequam Chriſto nomen daret, ne dubito quidem, praecipue ſi verum eſt quod legas in Origenis ſive Adamantii cujuſdam dialogis, adverſus Marcionitas, et Epiphanii LI. II. eum fuiſſe e numero LXX. diſcipulorum. *Bib. Gr. l.* 4. *c. v. T.* 3. *p.* 132.

one of the two diſciples that met Jeſus in the way to *Emmaus*.

The large accounts, which *Luke* has given in the book of the Acts of ſeveral, below the rank of Apoſtles, has made me think, that he was one of the ſame rank, and poſſibly one of them. There are three inſtances of this kind. The firſt is *Stephen*, one of the ſeven Deacons, who, as we learn, *was full of faith and power, and did great wonders and miracles among the people:* againſt whom there aroſe a ſtrong oppoſition, ſo that he was the very firſt Martyr for Chriſt and his doctrine, and of whom St. *Luke* has recorded a long diſcourſe before the Jewiſh Council. ch. vii. The ſecond is *Philip*, another of the Seven, of whom St. *Luke* writes, that he firſt *preached Chriſt* to the *Samaritans*. ch. viii. 5. . . . 8. *ſo that the people with one accord gave heed to thoſe things, which Philip ſpake, hearing, and ſeeing the miracles which he did*, and what follows. The ſame *Philip* afterwards, having firſt explained the ſcriptures to him, and brought him to ſincere faith in Jeſus as the Chriſt, baptized the Chamberlain and Treaſurer of the Queen of *Ethiopia*, a Jewiſh proſelyte, and a man of great diſtinction. ver. 26. . . 40. The third inſtance of this kind

is

is that of the men of *Cyprus* and *Cyrene*, *who travelled as far as Phenice, Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to Jews only.* Who ſoon after their coming to *Antioch, ſpake unto the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jeſus. And the hand of the Lord was with them. And a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord.* ch. xi. 19. . . 21. Theſe were the men, who firſt preached to Gentils out of *Judea:* as *Peter* was the firſt, who preached to Gentils at the houſe of *Cornelius* in *Ceſarea.* ch. x. and not long before them. We have, as it ſeems, the names of three of thoſe men. ch xiii. 1. *Simeon, called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen.* The ſecond perſon, here named, may be our Evangeliſt.

A like argument may be formed in favour of St. *Luke*'s having been one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples, in that he, and he only of all the Evangeliſts, has inſerted in his Goſpel an account of the commiſſion, which Chriſt gave unto them. ch. x. 1. . . . 20.

And indeed ſome learned men of later times, as well as formerly, have been of opinion, that *Luke* was one of the Seventy.

Among theſe is our Dr. *Whitby*, who *(b)*

(b) See his Preface to St. Luke's Goſpel.

reckoned both *Mark* and *Luke* to have been of that number.

J. A. Fabricius (c) was inclined to be of the ſame opinion. And in favour of it refers to the paſſages of *Adamantius* and *Epiphanius*, before taken notice of by us. This likewiſe was the ſentiment of *(d)* Mr. *Baſnage*.

Dr. *C. A. Heumann* has lately publiſhed a diſſertation concerning Chriſt's Seventy Diſciples, containing many curious obſervations. And he ſuppoſeth, that (*) theſe ſeveral following were of that number. *Matthias*, choſen in the room of the traitor, *Joſeph*, called *Barſabas*, ſurnamed *Juſtus*, and probably, the ſeven Deacons, or however, ſome of them, and the four teachers and Prophets of *Antioch*, *Barnabas*, *Simeon* called *Niger*, *Lu-*

(c) . . . praecipue, ſi verum eſt, quod legas in Origenis ſeu Adamantii cujuſdam Dialogis adverſus Marcionitas, et Epiphanii H. LI. n. xi. Neque adeo repugnat et Lucam et Marcum ex illis fuiſſe, licet Veteres miro conſenſu, ut Marcum Petri, ita Lucam tradunt Pauli fuiſſe interpretem et ſectatorem. Haud dubie enim Apoſtolorum etiam prae LXX illis magna praerogativa erat. &c. *Bib. Gr. l. iv. cap. v. T.* 3. *p.* 133.

(d) Ann. 60. *num. xxviii.*

(*) *Diſſertatio de Septuaginta Chriſti Legatis, ap. Nov. Syllog. Diſſertat. Part. i. p.* 120. . . . 154.

Lucius of Cyrene, whom he thinks to be our *Luke* the Evangeliſt, and *Manaen*. Acts xiii. 1.

His argument is to this purpoſe. We have not in the Goſpels the names of thoſe Diſciples. Nor did Chriſt form a college or companie of them, as he did of the Twelve, becauſe it was a temporarie office, which ſubſiſted for a ſhort time only. They were but once ſent forth. And when they were returned, their commiſſion was at an end. Neverthelefs they hereby became qualified for public ſervice. And it may be reckoned very probable, that if an opportunity was afforded, they would be very willing, after Chriſt's aſcenſion, to exert themſelves in his cauſe. And it is very likely, that ſome of theſe Seventy were choſen, and employed by the Apoſtles, as men, who had been already exerciſed in the ſervice of the goſpel, and were thereby fitted for farther uſefulneſſe.

So that learned writer. And it muſt be acknowledged, that this is a ſpecious argument. But it is rather founded in an ingenious ſpeculation, than in the authority of teſtimonie. Which, in this caſe, would be more valuable.

Indeed *Epiphanius*, beſide the places *(e)* formerly alleged, where he ſays, *Mark* and *Luke* were of the Seventy, has another: where *(f)* he mentions a great many, who were ſaid to be of that number: as the ſeven deacons, all whom he mentions by name, and alſo *Matthias*, *Mark*, *Luke*, *Juſtus*, *Barnabas*, *Apelles*, *Rufus*, *Niger*. And therefore, we cannot deny, that in the time of *Epiphanius* there were ſome, who entertained an opinion, that all theſe were of Chriſt's ſeventy Diſciples. Nevertheleſs we do not find it in *Irenaeus*, or *Clement of Alexandria*, or *Origen*, or any others of the higheſt antiquity, and beſt credit: nor in *Euſebe*, or *Jerome*, that I remember, who were acquainted with the writings of thoſe ancient authors, and many others, which are not come to us. *Euſebe* has a chapter concerning the Diſciples of our Saviour. He ſays, the names of Chriſt's twelve Apoſtles were well known: but (*g*) there was no where any catalogue of the Seventy. However, he mentions *Barnabas*, *Matthias*, and the diſciple put up with him, and

(*e*) *Haer. LI. num. vi. xi.* (*f*) *H. 20. num. iv.*

(*g*) Τῶν δὲ ἑβδομήκοντα μαθητῶν κατάλογος μὲν ἀδηλος ἀδαμῆ φέρεται. *H. E. l. i. c. 12.*

and one or two more, who were ſaid to be of the Seventy. But he takes not here any notice of *Mark*, or *Luke*, or of any of the ſeven Deacons.

Matthias and *Barſabas* certainly were ſuch men, as are deſcribed Acts i. 21. 22. And they may have been of the Seventy. But we cannot be certain, becauſe we have not been aſſured of it by any accounts, that demand full aſſent. Some of the ſeven Deacons may have been of the Seventy, as *Stephen* and *Philip*. But we do not know, that they were. It is very probable, that all thoſe Deacons were not of the Seventy, particularly, *Nicolas*, a proſelyte, of *Antioch*. If *Luke*, the Evangeliſt, be the ſame as *Lucius, of Cyrene*, there ariſeth a ſtrong objection againſt his having been one of the Seventy. *Simeon, called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene*, mentioned Acts xiii. 1. and *the men of Cyprus and Cyrene*, (of whom thoſe two, juſt mentioned, were a part:) were early believers, after Chriſt's aſcenſion, and they may have heard and ſeen the Lord in perſon. But they cannot be well ſuppoſed to have been of the Seventy. Chriſt's twelve Apoſtles were of *Galilee*. It is likely, that the Seventy alſo were of the ſame countrey,

or near it. Chriſt ſent them forth from him, to go over the land of *Iſrael*, and to return to him in a ſhort time, where he ſhould be. And his uſual reſidence was in *Galilee*. It does not appear to me at all probable, that our Lord put into that commiſſion any men, who were born, and uſually reſided abroad, in other countreys, out of the land of *Iſrael*.

Hitherto, then, we have not any full proof, that our Evangeliſt was one of the Seventy. Let us proceed.

St. *Luke* ch. xxiv. 13... 34. relates how two diſciples met Jeſus after his reſurrection, as they were going to *Emmaus*. And he ſays, that the name of one of them was *Cleophas*. *Theophylact* in his comment upon this place, as *(h)* formerly ſhewn, obſerves: "Some *(i)* ſay, that one of theſe two was *Luke* himſelf: but that the Evangeliſt concealed his own name." *Nicephorus Calliſti* (*k*) in one place, makes no doubt, that *Luke* was the other diſciple not named. It is likely,

(*h*) *Vol. xi. p.* 423.

(*i*) Τινὲς τὸν ἕνα τέτων τῶν δύο αὐτὸν τὸν λουκᾶν εἶναί φασι· διὸ καὶ ἀπέκρυψε τὸ ἑαυτῦ ὄνομα ὁ εὐαγγελισής. *Theoph. in Luc. cap. xxiv. p.* 539.

(*k*) Τοῖς περὶ λεκάν καὶ κλεόπαν τὴν ὁδὸν παριῶσι γνωρίζεται, πρὸς ἑσπέραν εἰς δεῖπνον αὐτοῖς συγκατακλιθεῖς. *Niceph. l. i. c.* 34. *p.* 117.

ly, that he had met with it in more ancient writers. *Sam. Baſnage (l)* readily declares himſelf of the ſame opinion. Indeed, I think, it has a great appearance of probability. It is much more likely, than the tradition, or interpretation in *Epiphanius*, that *(m)* it was *Nathanael.* The ſame *Baſnage* ſays, that if *Nathanael* had been the other, St. *Luke* would have named him.

St. *Mark* ch. xvi. 12. 13. has a like account, but briefer, of two, to whom Chriſt appeared, as *they were walking into the countrey.* He does not name either of them. *Grotius (n)* allows, that *Mark*'s and *Luke*'s hiſtories are of the ſame perſons. Both the Evangeliſts ſpeak of theſe as *two of them.* They were not of the Twelve, but yet they were of their companie, ſuch as had been

(*l*) Nulla ſane magis idonea ratio obſervatur animo, cur Cleopae, non alterius, Lucas meminerit: quomodo Joannes, ubi de ſe mentionem agitat, nomen diſſimulat ſuum. Si de grege Apoſtolorum fuiſſent, aut virorum multa laude in Evangelio celebratorum, uti Nathanael, quod Epiphanio viſum, iterum atque iterum dicemus, tam ejus quam Cleopae nomen foeneraſſet. *Ann.* 33. *num. CL.*

(*m*) *See vol. viii. p.* 316.

(*n*) Quare immerito Euthymius hic aliam putat hiſtoriam indicari, quam eam, quae a Luca copioſe deſcribitur. *Grot. ad Marc. xvi.* 12.

with Jeſus: as is allowed by *(o) Grotius*, and *(p) Beza*. Nevertheleſs they ſay, that *(q) Luke* is not the other. He is excluded, as they ſay, by the tenour of his introductions both to his Goſpel, and the Acts. Their reaſonings will be conſidered preſently.

However, ſuppoſing *Luke* to be the perſon here intended, I do not think, that he is thereby ſhewn to be one of the Seventy. *Cleophas* and the other were diſciples of Chriſt, and eye-witneſſes. But it does not therefore follow, that they were of the number of the Seventy.

We

(o) .. δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν.] τῶν μετὰ ἰησοῦ γενομένων, ut ſupra dixit ver. 10. Nam hoc nomine etiam alii extra xii. cenſentur, praecipue qui de numero erant illorum ſeptuaginta. *Grot. ad Marc. xvi.* 11.

(p) Ex iis, ἐξ αὐτῶν, nempe diſcipulis, non autem ex Apoſtolis. Aliorum enim praeter Apoſtolos mentio facta fuit praecedente verſu 9. *Bez. in Luc. xxiv.* 13.

(q) Alterum fuiſſe hunc noſtrum Lucam, quidam ex veteribus arbitrantur, quorum opinio refellitur ex praefatione Actis Apoſtolorum praepoſita. *Bez. ad Luc. xxiv.* 18.

Duo ex illis, nempe eorum, quos modo λοιπῶν, *ceterorum* nomine deſignarat, e ſectatoribus Chriſti. Probabiliter ſentiunt Veteres, fuiſſe hos de numero LXX. .. Nomen alterius infra exprimit Lucas, Cleopam vocans. Alterum ipſum Lucam multi putârunt, quos ſatis ipſe refellit in Evangelii anteloquio, ab oculatis teſtibus ſe ſeparans. *Grot. ad Luc. xxiv.* 13.

We proceed. Among the Salutations in the epiſtle to the *Romans* are theſe. ch. xvi. 20. *Timothie my work-fellow, and Lucius, and Jaſon, and Soſipater, my kinſmen, ſalute you.* All theſe were Jewiſh believers, and, the three laſt mentioned, as it ſeems, were the Apoſtle's relations. That by *Lucius* ſome ſuppoſed the Evangeliſt *Luke* to be intended, we have been informed by ſo ancient a writer, as *Origen.* And it is very likely, that St. *Luke*'s name was writ differently: *Lucas*, *Lucius*, and *Lucanus.* There is the more reaſon to think, that the Evangeliſt is here intended, becauſe he muſt have been with the Apoſtle at the time of writing the epiſtle to the *Romans.* Says Mr. *Tillemont:* "Many *(r)* believe, that St. *Luke* is he, whom "St. *Paul* in his epiſtle to the *Romans* calls "*Lucius*, making his name a little more La-"tin. And it is the more likely, inaſmuch "as the Acts aſſure us, that St. *Luke* was "then with St. *Paul.* If that be ſo, he was "related to this Apoſtle." *Grotius*, who ſuppoſed our Evangeliſt to have been of *Antioch*, taking notice of the above-mentioned obſervation

(r) Mem. Ec. Tom. 2. S. Luc.

vation of *Origen*, ſays, that *(s) Lucius*, in Rome xvi. is the ſame, as *Lucius* of *Cyrene*, mentioned Acts xiii. 1.

Fabricius (t) eſteemed it ſomewhat probable, that *Lucius* is the Evangeliſt.

Dr. *Heumann* ſuppoſes *(u)* this *Lucius* to be St. *Luke*, and the ſame as *Lucius* of *Cyrene*, whom *(x)* he computes to be one of the ſeventy Diſciples, as before ſeen.

Mr.

(s) Docet nos Origenes, in annotationibus epiſtolae ad Romanos, fuiſſe qui crederent Lucium eum, qui in eadem epiſtola nominatur. xvi. 21. eſſe hunc ipſum Lucam, et Lucium dici flexione Romana, Lucam Graeca. Ego Lucium illum, cujus ibi meminit Paulus, puto non alium eſſe a Cyrenenſi, quem noſter hic nominat Actor. xiii. 1. *Grot. Praef. ad Evang. S. Luc.*

(t) Fuerunt enim jam olim, qui teſte Origene Lucam eundem putârunt cum Lucio, quem Paulus inter συγγενεῖς ſuos refert Rom. xvi. 21. Neque verisimilitudine deſtituitur haec ſententia. *Fab. Bib. Gr. ubi ſupra. p.* 132.

(u) Lucas non eſt verum, id eſt, pure expreſſum nomen Evangeliſtae, ſed vel Lucanus, (quem in modum et ex Silvanus factum eſt Silas,) vel Lucius. Ac perverisimile eſt, Evangeliſtam noſtrum eſſe Lucium illum Cyrenaeum, cujus fit mentio Act. xiii. 1. Quem nec diverſum eſſe credo ab illo Lucio, quem Paulus Rom. xvi. 21. vocat cognatum ſuum, ſimulque teſtatur, eum in ſuo comitatu fuiſſe. *Heuman. Ep. Miſc. T. 2. p.* 519.

(x) Jure igitur credimus, et hos quatuor [Act. xiii. 1.] fuiſſe e ſeptuaginta illorum diſcipulorum numero. Jam inter hos ſi Lucius non eſt alius quam Lucas Evangeliſta, merito et Lucam noſtrum recenſemus inter ſuptuaginta illos diſcipulos. *Diſſ. de* LXX. *Chriſti Legat.* §. *xx. p.* 149.

Mr. *Baſnage* likewiſe argues very ſtrongly, that *(y) Lucius* is our Evangeliſt.

Indeed this opinion cannot be well ſaid to be deſtitute of probability: ſince there is a good deal of reaſon to think, that *Luke* was in the Apoſtle's companie, when he wrote the epiſtle to the *Romans*. And if *Lucius* be not he, no mention is made of him. Which is very unlikely.

If this be our Evangeliſt, we hence learn, that he was a Jew, and related to the Apoſtle. And if this be *Lucius* of *Cyrene*, we know his character, and, in part, his hiſtorie, from Acts xi. 19 . . 21. and xiii. 1 . . . 4. He was an early Jewiſh believer after Chriſt's aſcenſion, and together with others was very ſerviceable in early preaching the goſpel to Jews and Gentils out of *Judea*. And, once more, if the other, who accompanied *Cleophas*

(y) Lucam Evangeliſtam Paulo conſanguineum fuiſſe veriſimilitudinis multum habet. Lucium ſane, cujus nomine Romanos ſalutat Apoſtolus, ex ipſius cognatis unus erat. Sunt vero non pertenues conjecturae, quibus adducamur ad exiſtimandum unum eundemque virum cum Luca Lucium eſſe. Quae antiqua ſane ſententia fuit, cujus meminit Origenes in Rom. xvi. . . . Silam quidem Paulus ipſe Silvanum vocat. Aderat etiam Paulo comes Lucas, cum miſſa eſt ad Romanos epiſtola, quem inſalutatos praeteriiſſe, prorſus fit incredibile: quod tamen factum fuiſſet, ſi Lucius eſt a Luca diverſus. *Baſn. ann.* 60. *n. xxxiii.*

phas in the way to *Emmaus*, be *Luke* the Evangeliſt, he was a diſciple and eye-witneſſe of Jeſus Chriſt. But I do not ſay, one of the Seventy.

Now we come to conſider the objection of *Beza*, *Grotius*, and divers others: who have ſuppoſed, that St. *Luke*, in the introduction to his Goſpel, excludes himſelf from the number of eye-witneſſes. But though this has been a difficulty with many, there have been of late divers learned men, remarkable for inquiſitiveneſſe, and good judgement, who are not much moved by it. One of them is Dr. *Whitby*, in his preface to St. *Luke*'s Goſpel, already taken notice of by us. Another is *(z) Fabricius*, a third *(a) Baſnage*, the fourth *Heumann*: who in his forecited Diſſertation obſerves, that *(b)* St. *Luke*'s introduction imports no more, than

(x) Neque obſtat porro, quod Lucas affirmat, ſe ea ſcribere, quae acceperit ab illis, qui fuiſſent ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται. Nam non de omnibus LXX dici hoc poterat, quod Act. i. 21. et ſeq. ad Apoſtolum requiritur. *Bib. Gr. T. 3. p.* 133.

(a) Ann. 60. *num. xxviii.*

(b) Repugnare quidem videri poſſit ipſe Lucas cap. i. 2. ſcribens, ſe quae tradat accepiſſe α τοῖς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπταις. Verum non ſe negat fuiſſe αὐτόπτην, qui negat, ſe αὐτόπτην ἀπ' ἀρχῆς fuiſſe. Concedimus itaque, non ab initio

than that he was not an eye-witneſſe from the begining, nor an Apoſtle. But he may have been for ſome while a follower of Chriſt, very conſiſtently with what he there writes. And, probably, he was ſo. But he very fitly puts the credit and authority of his hiſtorie upon the teſtimonie of the Apoſtles.

I ſhall likewiſe tranſcribe below a paſſage of *Petavius* (*c*) from his Animadverſions upon *Epiphanius*, though it be ſomewhat long. I do

initio ſtatim, uti Apoſtolos, quos ὑπηρέτας τῦ λόγυ appellat, interfuiſſe rebus a Chriſto geſtis Lucam. Sed aliquo jam tempore functo ſuo munere Meſſiae ſe applicuiſſe Lucam, et poſtea ſemper in ejus comitatu fuiſſe, quo minus credamus, hoc ipſius teſtimonium minime impedit. Accedit, quod modeſtiae erat, Apoſtolorum potius, quam ſuum ipſius teſtimonium commendare, jubereque lectores, ſi forte ſibi crediturі ſint aegrius, fidem habere Apoſtolis, teſtibus nulli obnoxiis exceptioni. *Heum. Diſſ. ib. num. xx.*

(*c*) Quod Lucas & diſcipulorum numero fuerit, aſſerit et Dorotheus in Synopſi . . . Sed contra ſentiunt plerique, et id ex ipſis Lucae verbis colligunt, cum ait: Ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ . . Sed tantum abeſt, ut haec diſcipulum Chriſti fuiſſe, ac non pleraque, cum ab eo gererentur, oculis uſurpaſſe negent, ut contrarium potius hinc eluci poſſit. Verbum enim παρακολυθεῖν nonnunquam ad eam notitiam refertur, quae oculis ipſis, ac propria intelligentia comparatur, non aliorum ſermonibus. Ut cum Demoſthenes ἐν τῷ περὶ παραπρεσβείας, de Aeſchine, cujus in legatione comes fuerat, ſic loquitur: Καὶ ὁ τότυ πονηρεύματα εἰδὼς, καὶ

I do it the rather, becauſe he is an older author than any of thoſe, hitherto cited in behalf of this interpretation. He is conſidering what *Epiphanius* ſays of *Luke*'s being one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples. The ſum of what he advanceth is to this purpoſe: "He dares not affirm, that *Luke* was a diſ-" ciple of Chriſt, becauſe many of the Fa-" thers have thought otherwiſe. But he " ſays, there is nothing in St. *Luke*'s intro-" duction to induce us to think, he was " not a diſciple of Chriſt, or that he had " not ſeen a large part of the things related " by him: but rather the contrarie. And " he was willing to ſhew, that *Epiphanius* " is not contradicted by St. *Luke* himſelf."

7. St.

καὶ παρηκολουθηκὼς ἅπασι κατηγορῶ. Sic igitur Lucas ἄνωθεν παρηκολουθηκέναι πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς dicitur, hoc eſt, comperta, exploratáque, ac ſpectata etiam, habuiſſe. Ac videri poteſt, et nonnulla haec antiheſis eſſe, ut cum ſuperiore verſu dixerit: Quemadmodum multi res a Chriſto geſtas ſcribere aggreſſi ſunt, καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ſtatim ſubjiciat: Ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ παρηκολουθηκότι, hoc eſt, qui non, ut illi ἐκ παραδόσεως, ſed ex propria id ſcientia compererim. Ceterum tametſi ad eum ſenſum accommodari Lucae verba nihil prohibet, non idcirco tamen Chriſti diſcipulum fuiſſe certo pronunciare auſim: cum huic adverſari ſententiae longe plures Patres intelligam. Sed iſta commemoravi, ut ne Lucae ipſi de ſe teſtanti refragari quiſquam Epiphanium arbitretur. *Petav. Animadv. in Epiphan. Haer.* LI. *num. xi. p.* 89. 90.

7. St. *Luke* was for a good while a conſtant companion of St. *Paul*. But he was alſo acquainted with other Apoſtles.

Tertullian, and *Chryſoſtom*, as we have ſeen, call St. *Paul Luke*'s Maſter. But they need not be underſtood to intend, that *Luke* learned nothing from other Apoſtles. So *Irenaeus* ſaid: "*Luke*, the companion of *Paul*, put down in a book the Goſpel that had been preached by *Paul*." But in another place he ſays: "That (*) *Luke* was a fellow-laborer of the Apoſtles, eſpecially, of *Paul*." And in another place he calls *Luke* (**) "a follower and diſciple of the Apoſtles." And *Euſebius* ſaid: "*Luke* was for the moſt part a companion of *Paul*, but had alſo more than a ſlight acquaintance with the other Apoſtles." And *Jerome* ſays: "It was ſuppoſed, that *Luke* did not learn "his Goſpel from the Apoſtle *Paul* only, "who had not converſed with the Lord "in the fleſh, but alſo from other Apoſtles. "Which alſo he acknowledgeth at the be-

"gining

(*) Quoniam non ſolum proſequutor, ſed et cooperarius fuerit Apoſtolorum, maxime autem Pauli. *Iren. l.* 3. *c.* 14. *n.* 1. *p.* 201. *b.*

(**) Lucas autem ſectator et diſcipulas Apoſtolorum. *Ibid. cap. x.* [*al. xi.*] *in p.* 189.

" gining of his volume, ſaying: *Even as*
" *they delivered them unto us, who from the*
" *begining were eye-witneſſes of the word.*"

That muſt be right, I think, becauſe it is agreeable to the writer's own words in the introduction to his work. I always conſider *Paul* as an *eye-witneſſe*. But he was not an eye witneſſe from the begining: nor *a miniſter of the word*, from the begining. He muſt have had a diſtinct knowledge of all things concerning the Lord Jeſus. Chriſtianity, as has been often, and juſtly ſaid, is founded in facts. In order to preach it, *Paul* muſt have had a knowledge of Chriſt's life, preaching, miracles, death, reſurrection, and aſcenſion. As he was not inſtructed by other Apoſtles in the doctrine preached by him, he muſt have had it from revelation. And I ſuppoſe, that a man, who, like *Luke*, often heard *Paul* preach, might have compoſed a Goſpel, or hiſtorie of Jeſus Chriſt from *Paul*'s ſermons, preached in divers places, and to men of all characters. And the ancients ſeem to have ſuppoſed, that *Luke* had thereby great aſſiſtances for compoſing his Goſpel. Which I do not deny. Nevertheleſs it ſeems fairly

to

to be concluded from his own introduction, that he had conſulted others alſo.

It might not be amiſs, if I had room for ſuch obſervations, to compare St. *Luke*'s Goſpel and the hiſtorical parts of St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, and alſo of his diſcourſes recorded by *Luke* himſelf in the book of the Acts. It is reaſonable to think, that wherever any diſciples of Jeſus preached the Chriſtian Religion, they gave an account of the things concerning Chriſt. Wherever the Apoſtles, or others, preached, in order to induce faith in Jeſus and his doctrine, their firſt diſcourſes muſt have been hiſtorical. The reaſon of the thing leads us to this. And we are aſſured of it from their diſcourſes, of which we have an account. We perceive this in the diſcourſes of St. *Peter* at *Jeruſalem*. Acts ii. 22 . . . 36. iii. 12 . . . 26. iv. 10. and at the houſe of *Cornelius* in *Ceſarea*, x. 34 . . . 43. from *Paul*'s diſcourſes in the ſynagogue at *Antioch* in *Piſidia*. Ch. xiii. 23 . . . 38. at *Athens*. xvii. 31. at *Corinth*. xix. 8. before the Governour *Feſtus*, and King *Agrippa*, ch. xxvi. and at *Rome*: though then many years had paſſed, ſince the aſcenſion of Chriſt, and ſince his religion had begun to be preached, and pro-

pagated in the world. St. *Luke*'s general account of *Paul* there is thus: *And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired houſe, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching thoſe things which concern the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* xxvii. 30. 31. "That is, ſays *(d) Grotius*, "his miracles, doctrine, death, reſurrection, "and the miſſion of the Spirit: by which "things men were aſſured, that the hea-"venly kingdom was ſet up." And this may have been the occaſion of the frequent uſe of thoſe expreſſions, *preaching Chriſt, and preaching Jeſus Chriſt*, as equivalent to preaching the Chriſtian Religion, or the doctrine of the Goſpel.

I muſt own, that in the ſurvey of St. *Luke*'s Goſpel, and St. *Paul*'s diſcourſes and epiſtles, I have not diſcerned any ſuch ſpecial agreement, as to be induced to think, that one of them had copied the other.

St. *Paul* ſays, at *Antioch* in *Piſidia*, Acts xiii. 23. *Of this man's ſeed has God raiſed unto Iſrael a Saviour, Jeſus.* And 2 Tim. ii. 8. *Remember,*

(d) Miracula ejus, et praecepta, et mortem, et reſurrectionem, et miſſionem Spiritus Sancti. Per quae certi fiebant homines de regno illo coeleſti. *Gr. ad Act. xxviii.* 31.

Remember, that Jeſus Chriſt, of the ſeed of David, was raiſed from the dead, according to my goſpel. Theſe things are agreeable to St. *Luke*'s Goſpel. But they are alſo in St. *Matthew*'s. And muſt have been taught by all the Apoſtles, and all preachers of the goſpel.

Acts xx. 35. *And to remember the words of the Lord Jeſus, how he ſaid: It is more bleſſed to give, than to receive.* That ſaying of our Lord is not recorded by St. *Luke* in his Goſpel, nor by any other of the Evangeliſts.

1 Cor. xv. 5 . . 7. *And that he was ſeen of Cephas, then of the Twelve. After that, he was ſeen of above five hundred brethren at once . . After that he was ſeen of James, then of all the Apoſtles.* St. *Luke*'s account of our Saviour's appearances after his reſurrection are in ch. xxiv. and Acts i. 1 . . . 12. And if they are obſerved, I ſuppoſe, that no remarkable agreement between *Paul* and *Luke* will be diſcerned, but rather the contrarie. The *five hundred brethren*, mentioned by St. *Paul*, probably, ſaw Jeſus in *Galilee:* where, as in Matth. xxvi. 32. xxviii. 7. and Mark xvi. 7. he appointed to meet the diſciples. But of this there is nothing in St. *Luke*. And all our Saviour's appearances

to the diſciples, mentioned by him, were at *Jeruſalem*, or in it's neighborhood. Nor does *Luke* give any hint of that particular appearance to *James*, mentioned by St. *Paul*. Not now to add any thing farther.

However, I ſhall tranſcribe below *(e)* ſome obſervations of Mr. *Wetſtein*, relating to this matter.

8. It may be reckoned probable, that St. *Luke* died a natural death: foraſmuch as none of the moſt ancient writers, ſuch as *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *Irenaeus*, *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Jerome*, ſay any thing of his martyrdom. *Gregorie Nazianzen*, in *(f)* one of his orations, ſeems to put *Luke* among Martyrs. Nevertheleſs, as is well obſerved by *(g) Tillemont*, *Elias Cretenſis*, in the eighth centurie, famous for his Commentaries upon *Gregorie*, ſuppoſeth it certain, that *(h) Luke* did not

(e) Si Lucas vel Pauli hortatu, vel peculiari Spiritus Sancti affiatu ad ſcribendum impulſus fuiſſet, rem memoratu tam dignam . . . ſilentio neutiquam tranſiiſſet. Quod vero quidam exiſtimant, ex locis 2. Tim. ii. 8. et 1. Cor. xv. 4. collatis cum Luc. x. 7. et xxiv. 34. probari, Lucae, quod dicitur, Evangelium ad Paulum potius auctorem eſſe referendum, nobis parum ſit veroſimile. *Wetſten. ad Luc. cap. i. ver. 3. Tom. i. p.* 644.

(f) Orat. 3. p. 76. *(g) St. Luc. Mem. Ec. T. 2.*

(h) Quippe ne longe abeam, Joannes . . . et item Lucas haud-

not dye a Martyr any more than *John*, the Apoſtle and Evangeliſt: but that after having ſuffered much in the cauſe of Chriſt, and the goſpel, he returned in peace to the God of peace. *Gaudentius*, Biſhop of *Breſcia*, about 387. obſerves, that *(i)* in his time it was generally ſaid, that *Luke* and *Andrew* finiſhed their courſe at *Patrae* in *Achaia*. He does not ſay, in the way of martyrdom. I do not perceive *Paulinus*, about the year 403. to *(k)* celebrate *Luke*, as a Martyr, but rather *Nazarius*, mentioned in the next verſe. If Martyr belongs to *Luke*, it may be underſtood in a general ſenſe, as equivalent to Confeſſor, or a great ſufferer for the goſpel.

9. *Cave* ſays, that *(l)* *Luke* lived a ſingle

haudquaquam interempti fuere, verum cum permultas propter Chriſtum et ejus evangelium calamitates pertuliſſent, in pace ad eum qui pacis Deus eſt, reverſi ſunt. *El. Cr. Annot. p.* 322. 323.

(i) Andreas et Lucas apud Patras, Achaiae civitatem, conſummati referuntur. *Gaud. Serm.* 17. *ap. Bib. PP. Tom.* 5. *p.* 969. *C.*

(k) Hic pater Andreas, et magno nomine Lucas,
Martyr et illuſtris ſanguine Nazarius.
Paulin. Ep. 32. *p.* 210. *Conf. Annot. p.* 75. *Paris* 1685.

(l) Vitam egit coelibem, ac mortuus eſt anno aetatis 84. circa annum (ut nonnulli volunt,) 70. Quo vero mortis genere incertum eſt. *Hiſt. Lit. p.* 25.

life, and died in the 84. year of his age, about the year of Chriſt 70. but of what death, is uncertain. And it is true, that *Nicephorus*, in the fourteenth centurie, ſays, that *(m)* *Luke* died in the 80. year of his age. And in ſome editions of *Jerome*'s book of Illuſtrious Men there is a paſſage, near the end of the article of St. *Luke*, importing, that he lived 84 years in celibacie. But *Martiany*, the learned *Benedictin* editor of *Jerome*'s works, ſays, that *(n)* paſſage is not in any manuſcripts. Nor does he know, whence that ſilly fiction was borrowed. *Fabricius (o)* confirms that account.

The Time of this Goſpel.

IV. There is no great difficulty in ſettling the time of St. *Luke*'s writing his Goſpel. The Acts of the Apoſtles were publiſhed in 63. or 64. and not long after his Goſpel, as is generally allowed. Accordingly Dr. *Mill* ſup-

(m) Ὀγδοήκοντα ἐτῶν γενόμενος. ὥς φασιν. *Niceph. l.* 2. *c.* 43.

(n) Falſo additur in hoc loco: *Vixit octoginta et quatuor annos, uxorem non habens.* Nullum exſtat veſtigium horum verborum in manuſcriptis codicibus. Neque novi, unde putida haec commenta fluxerint. *Martian.*

(o) Sed illa Eraſmus, Martinus Lipſius, et Suffridus Petri, in examplaribus ſuis mſſ. non invenerunt. *Fabr. in loc. ap. Bib. Eccleſ.*

(p) ſuppoſeth thoſe books to have been two parts of one and the ſame volume, and to have been publiſhed in the year of Chriſt 64.

This argument was repreſented at length (q) formerly. The reader is referred to it, that I may not enlarge upon it in this place.

V. However, I cannot forbear to obſerve ſome marks of time in the Goſpel itſelf.

Marks of Time in the Goſpel itſelf.

1. The occaſion of writing it, as St. *Luke* aſſures us in the introduction, was, that *many* had already publiſhed narrations of theſe things. But it cannot be reaſonably thought, that many ſhould have writ hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt preſently after his aſcenſion, nor indeed till many years after it.

2. There are ſeveral things in the Goſpel, from which it may be fairly argued, that it was not writ, till after *Peter* and *Paul*, and perhaps other Apoſtles likewiſe, had preached to Gentils, and received them into the Church, without their embracing the peculiarities of the law of Moſes.

(p) Voluminibus hujus D. Lucae partem poſteriorem, ſeu λόγου δεύτερον quod attinet, librum dico Actuum Apoſtolorum, haud dubium eſt, quin is ſcriptus fuerit ſtatim poſt λόγου πρῶτον, ſive Evangelium. *Proleg. num.* 121.

(q) *See in this volume ch. iv. ſect. iv. p.* 78. . . . 85.

3. In ch. ii. 10. the angel ſays to the ſhepherds near *Bethlehem : I bring you good tidings of great joy to all people.* At ver. 30. . . . 32. *Simeon* ſays, at the preſentation of Jeſus in the temple : *Mine eyes have ſeen thy ſalvation, which thou haſt prepared before the face of all people : a light to lighten the Gentils, and the glorie of thy people Iſrael.* In ch. iii. 8. ſays *John* the Baptiſt : *God is able of theſe ſtones to raiſe up children to Abraham.* And I might here refer to ch. i. 78. 79. I ſuppoſe, that when St. *Luke* recorded theſe things, he underſtood them. Which he could not do, till after the goſpel had been freely and fully publiſhed among Gentils.

4. That St. *Luke* underſtood the ſpirituality of the doctrine of the goſpel, may be concluded from the account, which he has given of our Lord's diſcourſe, recorded ch. vi. 20. . . . 49. I might for this refer to ch. i. 74. 75. and other places.

5. Ch. vii. 9. When our Lord had heard the centurion's profeſſion of faith, *he marvelled at him, and ſaid : I have not found ſo great faith, no not in Iſrael.* In Matth. viii. 11. 12. is a farther enlargement. The like to which may be ſeen in Luke xiii. 28. . . . 30.

6. In

6. In ch. xiii. 6. . . 9. is the parable of *the fig-tree, ſpared one year more:* repreſenting the ruin of the Jewiſh church and people as near, if they did not ſpeedily repent.

7. In ch. xi. 48. . . 51. are predictions of the calamities coming upon the Jewiſh people. In ch. xiii. 34. 35. are our Lord's lamentations over the city of *Jeruſalem*, in the view of the calamities coming upon it. See likewiſe xvii. 22. . . 37. xix. 11. . . 27. xx. 9. . . 18. xxi. 5. . . 11. and ver. 20. . . 35. As St. *Luke* enlargeth ſo much in his accounts of theſe predictions, it may be argued, that the accompliſhment was not far off, when he wrote.

8. In ch. xiv. 16. . . 24. is the parable of *a great ſupper*. When they who were firſt invited, refuſed to come. Whereupon the invitations were enlarged, and made more general. And in the end he who made the ſupper declares, that *they who were firſt bidden, ſhould not taſt of it:* repreſenting the call of the Gentils, and the general rejection of the Jews for their unbelief.

9. In ch. xiii. 18. . . 21. are the parables of the *grain of muſtard-ſeed*, and *leaven*, repreſenting the wonderful progreſſe of the goſpel:

goſpel: of which, probably, St. *Luke* had been witneſſe, when he recorded them.

10. Ch. xxiv. 46. 47. . . *And he ſaid unto them . . that repentance and remiſſion of ſins ſhould be preached in his name among all nations, begining at Jeruſalem.* When St. *Luke* wrote this, it is very likely, that he well underſtood the commiſſion of the Apoſtles, as reaching to men of all denominations, throughout the whole world.

11. But I need not enlarge farther on theſe internal characters of time, the other argument being ſufficient and ſatisfactorie.

The Place, where it was writ.

VI. I muſt ſay ſomething concerning the place, where St. *Luke*'s Goſpel was writ.

Jerome, as before *(r)* quoted, in the prologue to his Commentarie upon St. *Matthew*, ſays, that *(s) Luke*, the third Evangeliſt, publiſhed his Goſpel in the countreys of *Achaia* and *Bocötia*. In his book of Illuſtrious Men he ſays, the *(t)* Acts were writ at *Rome*. *Gregorie Nazianzen* ſays, that *(u) Luke* wrote for the *Greeks*, or in *Achaia*. And ſpeaking of the provinces of divers of the Apoſtles and Evan-

(r) Vol. x. p. 84. 85.

(s) In Achaiae Bocotiaeque partibus volumen condidit. *Ibid.*

(t) Ib. p. 95. *(u) Vol. ix. p.* 133.

Evangeliſts, he *(x)* aſſigns *Judea* to *Peter*, the Gentils to *Paul*, *Achaia* to *Luke*, *Epirus* to *Andrew*, *Epheſus* or *Aſia* to *John*, *India* to *Thomas*, *Italie* to *Mark*: in which countrey, undoubtedly, many of the ancients believed this laſt mentioned Evangeliſt to have writ his Goſpel. *Chryſoſtom* does not ſay, where *Luke* wrote: but only that *(y)* he wrote for all in general.

We are told by *(z) Philoſtorge*, that in the reign of the Emperour *Conſtantius* St. *Luke*'s reliques were tranſlated from *Achaia* to *Conſtantinople*. It muſt therefore have been the general perſuaſion in thoſe times, that St. *Luke* had died, and had been buried in *Achaia*. *Nicephorus* ſays, that *(a)* when *Paul* left *Rome*, *Luke* returned to *Greece*, where he preached the goſpel, and converted many: where alſo he ſuffered martyrdom, and was buried. Soon afterwards he ſays, that *(b)* in the reign of *Conſtantius Luke*'s body was tranſlated

(x) Ἐγω πέτρε ἡ ἰουδαῖα, τί παύλῳ κοινὸν πρὸς τὰ ἔθνη, λεκᾶ πρὸς ἀχαίαν . . . μαρκῷ πρὸς ἰταλίαν; *Gregor. Or.* 25. *p.* 438. *A.*

(y) Vol. x. p. 318. *(z) Vol. vii. p.* 317.

(a) Συνδιάγων δ' ἐν ῥώμη τῷ παύλῳ, ἐπανήκει τῇ ἑλλάδι ἔνθις. κ. λ. *Niceph. l.* 2. *cap.* 43. *p.* 210. *(b)*.

(b) Ibid. C.

tranſlated from *Thebes* to *Conſtantinople*. The connexion leads us by *Thebes* to underſtand *Thebes* in *Greece*.

Grotius ſays, he thinks, that *(c)* about the time that *Paul* left *Rome*, *Luke* alſo went thence into *Achaia*, and there wrote his books, which we have, as *Jerome* likewiſe ſays. *Cave* thought, that *(d)* both St. *Luke*'s books were writ at *Rome*, and before *Paul*'s captivity there was at an end.

But by *Mill*, *Grabe*, and *Wetſtein*, it is ſaid, that *Luke* publiſhed his Goſpel at *Alexandria*, in *Egypt*. Let us obſerve their proofs.

Firſt of all (*e*) *Mill* and *(f) Wetſtein* quote *Oecumenius*, as ſaying, that *Luke* preached at *Thebes* in *Egypt*. Nevertheleſs I do not find it

(c) Puto autem Româ iiſſe Lucam in Achaiam, atque ibi ab eo conſcriptos quos habemus libros. Quod et Hieronymus prodidit. *Grot. Praef. in Evang. Luc.*

(d) Utrumque anno Chriſti 59. S. Paulo nondum ex carcere dimiſſo, ſcripſiſſe videtur. *In Luca H. L. p.* 25.

(e) Certe poſt diſceſſum a Româ Libyam petiiſſe noſtrum hunc Evangeliſtam, ac apud Thebanos verbum praedicaſſe, teſtatur Oecumenius comment. in Lucam. *Mill. Prol. n.* 114.

(f) ... vel ſecundum Hieronymum . . in Achaiae Boeotiaeque finibus, qui tamen Thebas Aegyptias, ubi teſte Oecumenio Lucas praedicavit, pro Boeotiis accepiſſe videtur. *Wetſt. N. T. Tom. i. p.* 643.

it in *Oecumenius*. And I ſuppoſe, that *Simeon Metaphraſtes*, a writer of no great credit, in the tenth centurie, in his life of St. *Luke*, is their authority. For he is the writer quoted by *(g) Grabe*, though he does it cautiouſly. Nor does *Metaphraſtes* ſay, that St. *Luke* publiſhed his Goſpel in *Egypt*. He ſuppoſeth it to have been writ before he went thither. For he ſays, that *(h)* when *Luke* preached there, he ſometimes argued from the Old Teſtament, and ſometimes from the Goſpel, which he had writ.

It may be reckoned probable therefore, that this journey of St. *Luke* into *Egypt* is a mere fiction, a thing without ground aſcribed to him by ſome, after he had left *Paul*, and after he had writ his Goſpel.

Nevertheleſs thoſe learned men *(i)* have been

(g) Taceo recentiores, veluti Simeonem Metaphraſten, qui in Vita S. Lucae Graece et Latine edita ad calcem commentariorum Oecumenii. p. 857. D. ita ſcribit: Totam Libyam percurrens in Aegyptum pervenit. &c. *Grabe Spic. T. i. p.* 33.

(h) Καὶ νῦν μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς παράγων γραφῆς, νῦν δὲ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἔτος ἀνετάξατο εὐαγγελίῳ διερμηνέων αὐτοῖς τὰ περὶ χριστοῦ. *Sim. Metaphr. de Vit. S. Lucae p.* 858. *B.*

(i) Neque aliunde in aliam ſententiam ductum arbitror Hieronymum, qui in Achaiae Boetiaeque finibus hoc Evangelium

been pleaſed to argue from this paſſage of *Metaphraſtes*, that *Jerome* miſtook *Thebes* in *Boeötia* for *Thebes* in *Egypt*. Which appears to me to be altogether arbitrarie. I ſhould rather think, that ſome later writer miſtook the place, and inſtead of *Thebes* in *Boeötia*, thought of *Thebes* in *Egypt*, a very famous city, and better known to himſelf than the other.

It may be of uſe to take here more at large the paſſage of *Nicephorus*, in part quoted juſt now. " *Luke (k)* ſays he, was born at *An-*
" *tioch*, which is in *Syria*, by profeſſion a
" Phyſician, and alſo well ſkilled in painting.
" He came to *Paul* at *Thebes* with it's ſeven
" gates: where renouncing the errour of his
" anceſtors, he embraced the Chriſtian doc-
" trine, and of a Phyſician for the body,
" became a Phyſician for the Soul. He
" likewiſe wrote a Goſpel, as *Paul* dictated
" it to him, and alſo the Acts of the Apo-
" ſtles.

gelium conditum ait, quam quod ſeu lecto, ſeu ex traditione alicubi accepto, Lucam apud Thebanos praedicaſſe, ac conſcripſiſſe Evangelium, incolas iſtos fuiſſe exiſtimarit Thebarum Boeotiarum, non autem Thebarum urbis Aegypti ſuperioris. *Mill. Prol. n.* 115. *Vid. et Wetſten. citat. ſupra not. (f).*

(k) Niceph. l. 2. *cap.* 43. *p.* 210. *A. B.*

" ſtles. Whilſt *Paul* was at *Rome*, [or, " When *Paul* had been at *Rome*,] he return- " ed into (D) *Greece*." This, I think, muſt confirm our ſuppoſition, that ſomebody miſtook *Thebes* in *Egypt* for *Thebes* in *Boeötia*. It is plain, that *Nicephorus* means *Thebes* of *Greece*. And he ſeems to have ſuppoſed, in this place, that *Luke* was converted about the time that he came to be with *Paul* in *Macedonia* and *Greece*. See Acts xvi. 10. He ſays, *Luke returned into Greece*. Therefore the *Thebes* before-mentioned muſt have been in that countrey. Nor was *Paul* ever at *Thebes* in *Egypt*. *Luke* therefore could not meet him, and be converted by him there. He calls it *Thebes with it's ſeven gates*. So *(l) Thebes* in *Boeötia* was ſometimes called.

Secondly. Another argument, that St. *Luke*'s Goſpel was writ at *Alexandria*, is, that

(D) All muſt be ſenſible, that this ſtorie of *Nicephorus* is very ſtrange. For in one place he without heſitation ſpeaks of St. *Luke*, as the companion of *Cleophas*, mentioned *Luke* xxiv. 18. *Lib.* 1. *cap.* 34. *p.* 117. *A.* And he ſeveral times ſpeaks of *Mark* and *Luke*, as two of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples. *Lib.* 2. *cap.* 43. *in et cap.* 45. *p.* 213. *B.* ἢ ἐκ τῶν ὁ δυο ἑτέρως, μάρκου ἢ λουκᾶ.

(l) Vid. Cellar. Geogr. Antiq. lib. 2. *cap.* 13.

that *(m)* it is ſo ſaid in the *Syriac* verſion.

But thoſe titles are of no great weight. Before the three Catholic Epiſtles, received by the *Syrians*, is a title or inſcription, importing, that *(n)* they were writ by *the Apoſtles, James, Peter, and John, witneſſes of our Saviour's transfiguration*, taking *James* to be the ſon of *Zebedee:* whereas the epiſtle of *James* could not be writ till long after his death, who was beheaded by *Herod Agrippa*, as related Acts xii. 1. 2. And St. *Paul*'s ſecond epiſtle to *Timothie (o)* is ſaid by the ſame *Syrians*, to have been writ at *Rome*, and ſent by *Luke*. Which is manifeſtly contrarie to the epiſtle itſelf. See 2 Tim. iv. 11. 12.

St. *Luke*'s Goſpel is alſo ſaid in the *Perſic* verſion, *(p)* to have been writ at *Alexandria*.

But

(m) Ita quippe ſonat titulus ejus in verſione Syriaca, ante mille annos edita: Evangelium Lucae Evangeliſtae, quod protulit et evangelizavit Graece in Alexandria magna. *Grabe Spic. T. i p.* 33. *Conf. Mill. Prol. n.* 114.

(n) Sanctorum Apoſtolorum, Jacobi, Petri, Johannis, transfigurationis Chriſti ſpectatorum, epiſtolae ſingulae.

(o) Ad Timotheum vero ſecunda Romae ſcripta, fuit miſſa per eundem Lucam Medicum et Evangeliſtam. *Ebedjeſu Catal. ap. Aſſeman. Bib. Or. T.* 3. *p.* 12.

(p) Et in verſione Perſica, quam tamen non ex Graeco, ſed Syriaco textu tranſlatam exiſtimat admodum R. Waltonus: Evangelium Lucae, quod lingua Graeca Aegyptiaca in Alexandria ſcripſit. *Grab. ubi ſupr. p.* 33.

But then it is allowed, that this verſion was made from the *Syriac*, not from the *Greek*.

Thirdly, it is alſo urged, that there are *epigraphai* or inſcriptions in ſome manuſcripts, at the end of this Goſpel, where it is ſaid, that it was writ in the great city of *Alexandria*.

But it is well known, that thoſe inſcriptions at the end of the books of the New Teſtament are of little value, divers of them containing manifeſt miſtakes: and they are in late manuſcripts only, or however, ſuch as are not of the higheſt antiquity.

Fourthly. *Grabe (q)* likewiſe inſiſts upon a paſſage in the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, where the Apoſtles are brought in, relating what Biſhops had been appointed by them in their own time. And it is ſaid, that in *Alexandria*, *Anianus*, the firſt Biſhop, was ordained by the Evangeliſt *Mark*, and *Abilius* by *Luke*, alſo Evangeliſt. And *(r) Mill* in like

(q) Atque hoc non parum confirmatur ex eo quod lib. vii. Conſt. Apoſt. Clement. cap. 46. Lucas dicatur Alexandriae fuiſſe, ibique Epiſcopum Avilium ordinaſſe. *Urbis Alexandrinorum Anianus primus a Marco Evangeliſta ordinatus eſt, ſecundus vero Avilius a Luca, et ipſo Evangeliſta.* Grabe ibid.

(r) Et ſi Conſtitutionum Apoſtolicarum ſeu auctori ſeu conſarcinatori fides, in eccleſia Alexandria, a Marco primum

like manner quotes the Conſtitutions, after *Grabe*, though almoſt aſhamed ſo to do.

But it ſhould be conſidred, that the author of that work is anonymous, and unknown, and his time not certain. He ſays what he pleaſeth. And has been convicted of falſhood in ſuch accounts *(s)* as theſe, as well as in others. It has very much the appearance of fiction, that the firſt Biſhop of *Alexandria* ſhould be ordained by *Mark*, and the ſecond by *Luke*. And poſſibly it is a fiction of the writer himſelf. For I do not recollect, that this is ſaid any where elſe. *Epiphanius*, as well as more ancient writers, muſt have been totally unacquainted with this ordination, and with St. *Luke*'s journeys in *Egypt*. For he ſays, that *(t)* this Evangeliſt preached the goſpel in *Dalmatia*, *Gaul*, *Italie*, and *Macedonia*, but eſpecially in *Gaul*.

Du Pin having taken notice of what is ſaid relating to this matter in the inſcriptions, which are in ſome manuſcripts, the titles in the *Syriac* and *Perſic* verſions, *Metaphraſtes*, and the Conſtitutions, concludes: " All *(u)* " theſe

mum fundata. . . . Avilium Aniani primi Epiſcopi ſucceſſorem, ordinaverit. *Mill. Prol. n.* 141.

(s) See in this work vol. viii. p. 352.

(t) Haer. L. i. num. xi. p. 433.

(u) Diſſerta. ſur la Bible. liv. 2. ch. 2. §. v. p. 39.

" theſe monuments deſerve no credit. We " ought to adhere to what is ſaid by *Jerome*, " as moſt probable: that this Goſpel was " compoſed in *Achaia*, or *Boeötia*."

Upon the whole, there appears not any good reaſon to ſay, that St. *Luke* wrote his Goſpel at *Alexandria*, or that he preached at all in *Egypt*. It is more probable, that when he left *Paul*, he went into *Greece*, and there compoſed, or finiſhed, and publiſhed his Goſpel, and the Acts of the Apoſtles.

His Character.

VII. I would now offer ſomething by way of character of this Evangeliſt. But I ſhall do it briefly, and cautiouſly. And if I mention doubtful things doubtfully, I may hope to eſcape cenſure. It is probable, that he is *Lucius*, mentioned Rom. xvi. 21. If ſo, he was related to St. *Paul* the Apoſtle. And it is not unlikely, that that *Lucius* is the ſame as *Lucius* of *Cyrene*, mentioned by name. Acts xiii. 1. and in general with others. ch. xi. 20. It appears to me very probable, that St. *Luke* was a Jew by birth, and an early Jewiſh believer. This muſt be reckoned to be a kind of requiſite qualification for writing a hiſtorie of Chriſt and the early preaching of his Apoſtles to ad-

vantage. Which, certainly, St. *Luke* has performed. I do not perceive ſufficient reaſon to believe, that *Luke* was one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples. But he may have been one of the two, whom our Lord met in the way to *Emmaus*, on the day of his reſurrection, as related Luke xxiv. 13 . . 35. He is expreſſly ſtiled by the Apoſtle *his fellow-laborer*. Philem. ver. 24. If he be the perſon intended Col. iv. 14. (which ſeems very probable,) he was, or had been, by profeſſion a Phyſician. And he was greatly valued by the Apoſtle, who calls him *beloved*. Which muſt be reckoned much to his honour. For nothing could be ſo likely to recommend any man to St. *Paul*'s eſteem, as faithfulneſſe to the intereſts of pure religion. It is undoubted, that he accompanied *Paul*, when he firſt went into *Macedonia*. Acts xvi. 8 . . . 40. And though we are not fully aſſured, that he continued to be with him, conſtantly afterwards: we know, that he went with the Apoſtle from *Greece* through *Macedonia*, and *Aſia*, to *Jeruſalem*, and thence to *Rome*, where he ſtayed with him the whole two years of his impriſonment in that city. This alone makes out the ſpace

of

of above five years. And it is an attendence well becoming *Lucius* of *Cyrene*: to which no man could be more readily diſpoſed, than one of the firſt preachers of the goſpel to the Gentils. We do not exactly know, when St. *Luke* formed the deſign of writing his two books. But, probably, they are the labour of ſeveral years. During St. *Paul*'s impriſonment in *Judea*, which laſted more than two years, and was a time of inaction for the Apoſtle, St. *Luke* had an opportunity for compleating his collections, and filling up his plan. For in that time unqueſtionably *Luke* converſed with many early Jewiſh believers, and eye-witneſſes of the Lord, and ſome of the Apoſtles, who were ſtill at *Jeruſalem*. And I make no doubt, but that before that ſeaſon he had converſed with ſeveral of the Apoſtles, and other eye-witneſſes of our Lord's perſon and works. Nor can any heſitate to allow the truth of what is ſaid by ſome of the ancients, that *Luke*, who for the moſt part was a companion of *Paul*, had likewiſe more than a ſlight acquaintance with the reſt of the Apoſtles. Whilſt he was with *Paul* at *Rome*, it is likely, that he had ſome

leiſure for compoſing, and writing. When St. *Paul* left *Rome*, I imagine, that *Luke* accompanied him no longer: but went into *Greece*, where he finiſhed, and publiſhed, one after the other, his two books. Which he inſcribed to *Theophilus*, an honorable friend, and a good Chriſtian in that countrey. Here *Luke* died, and, perhaps ſomewhat in years. Nor need it to be reckoned an improbable ſuppoſition, that he was older than the Apoſtle.

Obſervations upon his Goſpel.

VIII. I ſhall conclude this chapter with ſome obſervations upon St. *Luke*'s Goſpel, and the Acts of the Apoſtles. But thoſe upon his Goſpel will chiefly relate to the introduction: though ſome were mentioned formerly.

1. St. *Luke*'s two books, his Goſpel and the Acts, are inſcribed to *Theophilus*. Whereby ſome underſtand any good Chriſtian in general, others a particular perſon.

Epiphanius (x) ſpeaks as if he was in doubt, whether thereby ſhould be underſtood a particular perſon, or a lover of God in

(x) Εἰτ' ἓν τινὶ θεοφιλῶ τότε γράφων τῦτο ἔλεγεν, ἢ παντὶ ἀνθρώπω θεὸν ἀγαπῶντι. *Epiph. Haer. LI. n. vii. p.* 429. *A.*

in general. *Salvian (y)* ſeems to have ſuppoſed it to be only a feigned name.

Auguſtin (z) and *Chryſoſtom (a)*, and many others, have thereby underſtood a real perſon. *Theophylact* expreſſeth himſelf after this manner: "*Theophilus (b)* to whom "*Luke* wrote, was a man of ſenatorian rank, "and poſſibly a Governour: foraſmuch as "he calls him *moſt excellent*, the ſame title, "which *Paul* uſeth in his addreſſes to *Fe*-"*lix* and *Feſtus*." *Oecumenius* ſays, "that *(c) Theophilus* was a Prefect or Governour." However, we have no particular account in the ancients, who he was, or of what countrey.

Cave (d) ſuppoſed *Theophilus* to have been

 a Noble-

(y) Poſitus itaque in hoc ambiguae opinionis incerto, optimum fere credidit, ut beati Evangeliſtae ſacratiſſimum ſequeretur exemplum: qui in utroque divini operis exordio Theophili nomen inſcribens, cum ad hominem ſcripſiſſe videatur, ad amorem Dei ſcripſit: hoc ſcilicet digniſſimum eſſe judicans, ut ad ipſum affectum Dei ſcripta dirigeret, a quo ad ſcribendum impulſus eſſet. *Salvian. ad Salon. ep.* 9. *p.* 215.

(z) De Conſenſ. Evan. l. 4. *c.* 8. *T.* 3.

(a) Chryſ. in Act. Hom. i. T. 9. *p.* 3. 4.

(b) See Vol. xi. p. 423.

(c) Ἡγεμὼν ἦν ὗτος ὁ θεόφιλος. &c. *Comm. in Act. T.* 2. *p.* 2. *C.*

(d) Utrumque opus inſcripſit Theophilo optimati, (ut credere fas eſt,) Antiocheno. *Hiſt. Lit. in Luca.*

a Nobleman of *Antioch.* And in his Lives of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts *(e)* writ in Engliſh, he refers to the Recognitions: where is mentioned a rich man of *Antioch*, of this name. But I do not eſteem that to be any proof, that St. *Luke's Theophilus* was of *Antioch.* That fabulous writer is not ſpeaking of *Paul*, nor of *Luke*, but of *Peter:* who, as he ſays, in *(f)* ſeven days converted ten thouſand people at *Antioch.* And *Theophilus*, the greateſt man in the city, turned his houſe into a church. Moreover, ſuppoſing him to intend St. *Luke's Theophilus*, his authority is of no value. A writer at the end of the ſecond centurie does not ſpeak of his own knowledge. And if St. *Luke* publiſhed his books in *Greece*, which to me ſeems probable, I ſhould be inclined to think, that *Theophilus*, to whom they are addreſſed, was a man of the ſame countrey.

2. It

(e) P. 224.

(f) Et ne multis immorer, intra ſeptem dies, plus quam decem millia hominum credentes Deo baptizati ſunt, et ſanctificatione conſecrati: ita ut omni aviditatis deſiderio Theophilus, qui erat cunctis potentibus in civitate ſublimior, domus ſuae ingentem baſilicam, eccleſiae nomine conſecravit, *Recogn. l. x. cap.* 71.

2. It may be of more importance to inquire, whom St. *Luke* means by the *many*, who before him had *attempted* to write hiſtories of Jeſus Chriſt. *Epiphanius* ſays, that *(g)* St. *Luke* intended *Cerinthus*, *Merinthus*, and others. How *Origen (h)* expreſſed himſelf concerning this, in his preface to St. *Luke*'s Goſpel: and how *Jerome (i)* in his preface to St. *Matthew*, may be ſeen by thoſe, who are pleaſed to look back. They ſay, that many attempted to write Goſpels, as *Baſilides*, *Apelles*, and others. And they mention divers Goſpels, not received by the Church: Such as the *Goſpel of Thomas*, and *Matthias*, *the Goſpels of the Egyptians*, and *of the Twelve*. But it is not neceſſarie to be ſuppoſed by us, that they thought, that all, if any, of thoſe Goſpels were writ before St. *Luke*'s, or that he ſpoke of them. For *Baſilides* and *Apelles* could not write Goſpels before the ſecond centurie. And they might ſuppoſe, that ſeveral, if not all the other, mentioned by them, were writ after St. *Luke*'s.

(g) . . φάσκων ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν· ἵνα τινὰς μὲν ἐπιχειρητὰς δείξῃ, φημὶ δὲ τὸς περὶ κήρινθον, καὶ μήρινθον, καὶ τὸς ἄλλους. *H. LI. n. vii. in.*

(h) See Vol. iii. p. 317. 318.

(i) See Vol. x. p. 140. 141.

Luke's. The meaning of what theſe ancient writers ſay, is, that the Church receives four Goſpels only. There were many others. But to them may be applied the words of St. *Luke*: they only *took in hand*, or *attempted*. They did not perform, as *Matthew*, and *Mark*, and *Luke*, and *John* did. And they might expreſs themſelves in that manner concerning Goſpels writ after St. *Luke*'s, as well as before it.

However, *Theophylact*, as was formerly *(k)* obſerved, in the preface to his Commentarie upon St. *Luke*, expreſſeth himſelf, as if he thought, the Evangeliſt referred to the Goſpels according to the *Egyptians*, and according to the *Twelve*.

3. We will now obſerve the judgements of ſome learned moderns. *Grabe (i)* allows, that St. *Luke* did not refer to the Goſpels of *Baſi-*

(k) Vol. xi. p. 422.

(i) Reliqua quippe ab Origene et Ambroſio nominata falſa Evangelia, veluti Baſilidis, aliudque Manichaeorum, Apoſtolo Thomae perperam adſcriptum, procul omni dubio poſt S. Lucae obitum prodiere: adeo ut ea in primis Evangelii verbis, in quorum explicatione Origenes et Ambroſius iſta afferunt, reſpicere haud potuerit. Contra vero haud eſt abſimile, iſta ſecundum Hebraeos et Aegyptios ante fuiſſe ſcripta, atque ad ea, una cum aliis pluribus jam ignotis, Lucam intendiſſe digitum, dum praefatus eſt. &c. *Gr. Spic. T. i. p.* 31. 32.

Baſilides, or *Thomas*, or ſome others, mentioned by *Origen*. For they were not publiſhed, till after St. *Luke*'s death. But he thinks, that St. *Luke* might refer to the Goſpels according to the *Egyptians*, and according to the *Twelve*, and ſome others, now unknown.

That St. *Luke* might refer to the Goſpel according to the *Egyptians*, he thinks for the following reaſons, which I ſhall conſider.

The firſt is, that *(k)* St. *Luke*'s Goſpel was writ in *Egypt*. To which I anſwer: That is ſaid without ground, as has been lately *(l)* ſhewn.

Grabe's ſecond argument is, that *(m) Clement* of *Rome*, or ſome other, in the fragment of the ſecond epiſtle aſcribed to him, has quoted the Goſpel according to the *Egyptians*.

(k) Evangelium, de quo agitur, ab Aegyptiis editum fuiſſe ante Lucae Evangelium, huncque iſtud inter alia, ſi non praecipue, reſpexiſſe, dum in prooemio plures hiſtorias evangelicas memorat, ad quas emendandas, et defectus eorum ſupplendos, ſuam literis conſignaſſe ſe innuit, probabile redditur ex eo, quod Lucas Evangelium ſcripſiſſe dicatur Alexandriae in Aegypto. *Id. ib. p.* 33. *in.*

(l) See before p. 273 . . 277.

(m) Accedit, quod jam Clemens Romanus, vel quiſquis eſt auctor ep. 2. ad Corinthios, certe antiquiſſimus, iſto Evangelio uſus eſſe ex fragmento mox recitando, colligatur. *Ibid. p.* 34.

Egyptians. Which argument, as one would think, might have been ſpared: ſince *Grabe* himſelf allows, that *(n)* ſecond epiſtle to be ſuppoſitious, and not to have been compoſed, till about the midle of the third centurie. If that be the true date of the epiſtle, it is too late a thing, to warrant the ſuppoſition, that St. *Luke* referred to the Goſpel according to the *Egyptians.*

I ſhall take no farther notice of *Grabe.* But I imagine, that the Goſpel according to the *Egyptians* was not compoſed before the ſecond centurie. *Clement* of *Alexandria* is the firſt known Catholic author, that has cited it. And in his time it was very obſcure and little known. This *(o)* was ſhewn formerly.

Dr. *Mill* does not much differ from *Grabe.* He thinks, that *(p)* of the many Narrations, to which St. *Luke* refers, the two principal were

(n) Ceterum quaeras, quando epiſtola illa Clementi ſuppoſita fuerat, reſpondeo, id ſeculo iii. et quidem medio, factum eſſe. *Ib. p.* 269. *in.*

(o) See Vol. ii. p. 527 . . . 530. *ſecond edition. p.* 526 . . 529. *firſt edition.*

(p) Ex dictis autem hiſce hiſtoriolis . . duae prae ceteris celebratae erant, quae et ipſae Exangelia appellabantur, ſecundum Hebraeos alterum, alterum ſecundum Aegyptios. *Proleg. n.* 38. *vid. et n.* 39 . . . 41. *et n.* 112. *&c.*

were the Goſpels according to the *Hebrews*, and according to the *Egyptians*.

The general account, which *Mill* gives of thoſe Memoirs or Narrations, ſeems to be very juſt and reaſonable. And I intend to tranſcribe him here largely. " About " *(q)* the year 58. or ſomewhat ſooner, " ſays *Mill*, were compoſed by ſome of the " faithful

(q) Sub hoc quidem tempus, annum dico LVIII. ſeu etiam aliquanto ante, contextae fuere a fidelibus quibuſdam illius aevi διηγήσεις evangelicae, ſeu hiſtoriolae de rebus Chriſti. Patet hoc ex Evangelii D. Lucae prooemio: . . . Exinde colligimus, in primis equidem, πολλὰς hoſce, qui hiſtoriolas conficiebant, alios prorſus eſſe ab Evangeliſtis noſtris, Matthaeo et Marco. Erat enim Matthaeus unus ex αὐτόπταις, ideoque neque ab iſtorum traditionibus pendebat, ſicut hi quos memorat Lucas. Ne dicam, quod duos duntaxat nemo πολλὰς dixerit. Deinde vero notandum, eos narrationes ſuas inſtituiſſe περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ὑμῖν πραγμάτων, hoc eſt, ut ego lubens interpretor, *de rebus apud primos fidei profeſſores*, quorum numero ſeipſum accenſet Lucas, a Chriſto *impletis* ſive geſtis. Denique liquet ex verbis modo citatis, traductas fuiſſe naratiunculas iſtas ſeu proxime, ſeu mediate ſaltem, ab Apoſtolis ipſis, eorumque in opere evangelico adjutoribus. Manifeſtum eſt igitur, fuiſſe e primis Chriſtianis nonnullos, qui ante Lucam, [addo etiam Matthuaem et Marcum,] res Chriſti, (ſeu Evangelia,) ex apoſtolicis traditionibus undecunque acceptis, conſcripſerant: idque non ſtudio aliquo maligno, ſeu haeretico, quod inſinuant fere qui in hoc Lucae prooemium commentati ſunt: ſed eodem plane fine, quo Evangeliſtae noſtri: ut haberet ſcilicet Eccleſia rerum a Domino

" faithful Evangelical Narrations, or ſhort " hiſtories of Chriſt. This appears from " St. *Luke*'s introduction to his Goſpel. " From which we learn, in the firſt place, " that they were not our Evangeliſts, *Mat-* " *thew* and *Mark*. For *Matthew* was an " eye-witneſſe. Nor can two be called " *many*. In the next place, it is to be ob- " ſerved, that theſe Narrations conſiſted of " *things moſt ſurely believed among us*, that " is, as I underſtand it, *of the things fulfilled* " *and done by Chriſt among the firſt profeſſors of* " *the faith:* of which number *Luke* reckons " himſelf. *Laſtly*, from the words of that " introduction it appears, that thoſe Nar- " rations were received either from the A- " poſtles themſelves, or from their aſſiſtants " in the work of the goſpel. It is there- " fore

a Domino noſtro geſtarum qualem qualem notitiam. Ceterum cum in iis quae ſequuntur apud Lucam, ſingula Chriſtianae rei hiſtoriam ſpectantia accurate ſe aſſecutum eſſe dicat Evangeliſta . . . haud obſcure quidem hinc colligi videtur, τῶν πολλῶν iſtorum διηγήσεις minus accuratas fuiſſe, minuſque perfectas: ita quidem, ut in his, quae tradiderant, aliqua hinc inde occurrerint parum certa, ne dicam a vero aberrantia. Unde omnino viſum ſit ipſi plenariam hiſtoriae hujus cognitionem conſecuto, integrum jam et luculentum rerum a Chriſto geſtarum Commentarium ſcribere. *Mill. Prolog. num.* 35 . . 37.

" fore manifeſt, that there were ſome of " the firſt Chriſtians, who before *Luke*, " (and alſo, as we may ſuppoſe, before " *Matthew* and *Mark*,) wrote hiſtories of " the things done by Chriſt, and received " from apoſtolical traditions: and that not " with a bad, or heretical deſign, as many " inſinuate, who comment upon this intro- " duction of St. *Luke*, but with the ſame " deſign, as our Evangeliſts: that Chriſtians " might have at leſt ſome account in wri- " ting of the Lord's actions. Nevertheleſs " it may be alſo inferred from what St. *Luke* " here ſays, that their hiſtories were inac- " curate, and imperfect: there were in them " ſome things not certain, or well atteſted, " and poſſibly, here and there, ſome miſ- " takes. For which cauſe it ſeemed good " to him, who had attained to full infor- " mation, to write a compleat and copious " hiſtorie of the things done by Chriſt."

If this account be right, ſome conſequences may be deduced, which will be of uſe to us.

And indeed, it ſeems to me to be very right. There were ſeveral hiſtories of Chriſt, to which St. *Luke* here refers. They were compoſed with a good view, like to that of

our

our Evangeliſts. But they were defective, and inaccurate. If there were any miſtakes, I would imagine, that they were not numerous, nor in things of the greateſt importance. Nor were the writers ſufficiently qualified for the work, which they had undertaken. This, I think, to be intimated by St. *Luke*, though modeſtly, and without cenſoriouſneſſe, in what he ſays of himſelf, *that he had perfect underſtanding of all things from the very firſt*. Which, probably, could not be ſaid of the compoſers of the Narrations, to which he refers. They were men, who had an honeſt zeal. But they had writ too haſtily, before they had obtained full information. For which reaſon their hiſtories could not anſwer the end aimed at.

Theſe things being allowed to be right, ſeveral conſequences may be deduced by us.

In the *firſt* place, and in particular, we hence learn, that the Goſpel according to the *Twelve*, or according to the *Hebrews*, was not one of thoſe Narrations, or Memoirs, to which St. *Luke* refers. For theſe were very ſhort hiſtories: [*hiſtoriolae* as *Mill* calls them:] that was a full Goſpel, or large hiſtorie of Jeſus Chriſt. Many, in *Jerome*'s time, ſuppoſed it to be the authentic Goſpel

of

of St. *Matthew*: which, certainly, is not a ſhort and imperfect Memoir. From the notice taken of that Goſpel by ſeveral ancient writers, eſpecially by *Jerome*, it appears to me very probable, (and I ſhould think, muſt appear very probable to others likewiſe,) that the Goſpel according to the *Twelve*, or according to the *Hebrews*, either was St. *Matthew*'s original *Hebrew* Goſpel, with additions: or his original *Greek* Goſpel, tranſlated into *Hebrew*, with additions. But this laſt ſeems to me moſt likely, as has been often ſaid already upon divers occaſions.

Secondly. Another thing to be deduced from *Mill*'s account, if right, is, that (E) the Goſpel according to the *Egyptians* was not one of the Narrations, to which St. *Luke* refers. For that Goſpel was not compoſed upon the ſame principles with thoſe of our Evangeliſts. It was an heretical Goſpel, as

(E) I am not ſingular in ſuppoſing, that the Goſpel according to the *Egyptians* is not intended by St. *Luke*. *Beza* ſays the ſame ſtrongly. And, as I imagine, he juſtly aſſerts, it not to have been writ, till after St. *Luke*'s Goſpel. Quod iſtos ait Lucas, non ſatis commode praeſtitiſſe: minime tamen opinor, fabuloſas, imo etiam impias narrationes intelligens, tandem Eccleſiae ſub Nicodemi, Nazaraeorum, Thomae, Aegyptiorum, nominibus impudentiſſime obtruſas. *Bez. ad Luc. cap. i. ver.* 1.

appears from the fragments of it, collected by *Grabe*, and (*r*) probably, it was compoſed in the ſecond centurie, by ſome *Encratites*, enemies of marriage.

Thirdly. I add one thing more, whether it be a conſequence from what has been already ſaid, or not: that nothing remains of the Narrations, to which St. *Luke* refers, not ſo much as any fragments, they not being quoted in any Chriſtian writings, now exſtant.

3. I ſhall now tranſcribe a part of Dr. *Doddridge*'s remarks upon St. *Luke*'s introduction. "This (*s*) muſt refer to ſome "hiſtories of the life of Chriſt, now loſt. "For *Matthew* and *Mark*, the only Evan- "geliſts that can be ſuppoſed to have writ- "ten before *Luke*, could not with any pro- "priety be called *many*. And of theſe "two, *Matthew* at leſt wrote from per- "ſonal knowledge, not from the teſti- "monie of others. I conclude, that the "books referred to are loſt: as I am well "ſatisfied, that none of the apocryphal "Goſpels, now extant, publiſhed, parti- "cularly

(*r*) *Vid. Grabe Spic. T. i. p.* 31. . . 37.
(*s*) *See his Family-Expoſitor. Vol. i. p.* 1.

" cularly, by *Fabricius*, and *Jones*, can pre-
" tend to equal antiquity, with this of St.
" *Luke*. . . . And St. *Luke* ſeems to allow
" theſe hiſtories, whatever they were, to
" have been honeſtly written, according
" to information received from capable
" judges."

4. Mr. *Beauſobre*, ſpeaking of theſe Memoirs, ſays: " The *(t)* life of our Saviour
" was ſo beautiful, his character ſo ſublime
" and divine, his doctrine ſo excellent, and
" the miracles, by which he confirmed it,
" were ſo ſhining, and ſo numerous, that
" it was impoſſible, but many ſhould under-
" take to write Memoirs of them. This
" produced many hiſtories of our Saviour,
" ſome more, others leſs exact. It is great
" pity, that they are loſt. For we might
" have conſulted them, and could have
" judged for ourſelves concerning the cha-
" racter of the writers, and their compo-
" ſition. St. *Luke*, who ſpeaks of Narra-
" tions, or Goſpels, that had preceded his
" own, intimates indeed, that they were
" defective, but he does not condemn them,
" as fabulous, or bad."

 5. That

(t) Hiſt. de Manich. Tom. i. p. 449.

5. That is right. Thoſe Memoirs were not bad, nor fabulous. But they were imperfect, as I apprehend, to a great degree. Nor do I lament the loſſe of them. I can pay ſo much deference to the judgement of Chriſtian Antiquity, eſpecially, the earlieſt of all, as to believe, that thoſe *many Narrations*, to which St. *Luke* refers, did not deſerve to be preſerved, or to be much taken notice of, after the publication of the Goſpels of our firſt three Evangeliſts. I imagine, that when once theſe came abroad, the former appeared to the faithful ſo low, and mean, and defective, that they could not bear to ſee, or read them.

Obſervations upon the book of the Acts.

IX. I ſhall now make ſome obſervations upon the other work of our Evangeliſt.

1. The book of the Acts was writ, according to *(u) Mill*, in the year 64. And from what has been argued by us in ſeveral places that muſt appear to be as likely a time, as any. It could not be writ, till after St. *Paul*'s confinement at *Rome* was come to a period. I ſuppoſe, it to have ended in the former part of the year of Chriſt

(u) Prolegom. num. 121.

Chriſt 63. And I think it probable, that St. *Luke* finiſhed this book the ſame, or the next year, either at *Rome*, or in *Greece*.

2. It cannot be diſagreeable to recollect here ſome of the obſervations of ancient writers upon this book, the only book of the kind, which we have, containing a hiſtorie of the preaching of Chriſt's Apoſtles after his reſurrection.

3. *Tertullian (x)* often ſpeaks of the importance of this book, as ſhewing Chriſt's fulfilment of the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt to his diſciples.

4. " The *(y)* Acts of the Apoſtles, ſays " *Jerome*, in his letter to *Paulinus*, concern- " ing the ſtudie of the Scriptures, ſeems to " promiſe a bare hiſtorie, and an account of " the early infance of the Church: but if " we conſider, that the writer is *Luke* the " Phyſician, we ſhall at the ſame time diſ- " cern, that every word is ſuited to heal the " maladies of the ſoul."

(x) See Vol. ii. p. 588. . . 590. *or p.* 587. . . 589.

(y) Actus Apoſtolorum nudam quidem ſonare videntur hiſtoriam, et naſcentis Eccleſiae infantiam texere. Sed ſi noverimus, ſcriptorem eorum Lucam eſte Medicum, cujus laus eſt in evangelio, animadvertemus pariter, omnia verba illius animae languentis eſſe medicinam. *Ad Paulin. ep.* 50. *al.* 103. *T.* 4. *P.* 2. *p.* 574.

5. Says *Auguſtin*: "*Luke (z)* after having "writ a Goſpel, containing a hiſtorie of "Chriſt's words and works to the time of "his reſurrection and aſcenſion, wrote ſuch "an account of the Acts of the Apoſtles, as "he judged to be ſufficient for the edifi-"cation of believers. And it is the only "hiſtorie of the Apoſtles, which has been "received by the Church: all other having "been rejected, as not to be relied upon."

6. I beg leave to refer my readers to the paſſages of *Chryſoſtom*, already (*a*) tranſcribed, relating to this book: and to the whole of his firſt homilie upon it. I add now only one paſſage more out of the ſame homilie. "The *(b)* Goſpels, ſays he, are the hiſ-"torie of the things, which Chriſt did, and "ſpake. The Acts the hiſtorie of the "things, which another Paraclet ſpake and "did."

7. It is not needful for me to make a diſtinct enumeration of the things contained in this book. Every one who has peruſed

(z) *See Vol. x. p. 237. 238.*

(*a*) *See Vol. x. p. 323. . . 330.*

(*b*) Τὰ μὲν ἓν εὐαγγέλια ἂν ὁ χριϛὸς ἐπόιησεν ϗ ἐῖπεν ἱϛορία τίς ἐ ἰν· αἱ δὲ πράξεις, ὧν ὁ ἕτερος παράκλητος εἶπε ϗ ἐπόιησε. *In Act. hom. i. Tom. 9. p. 9. B.*

peruſed it with care, cannot but know, that it contains an account of the choice of *Matthias* to be Apoſtle in the room of the traitor, of the wonderful and plentiful pouring out of the gift of the Holy Ghoſt upon the Apoſtles, and other diſciples of Jeſus at *Jeruſalem*, at the Pentecoſt next ſucceding his crucifixion, and of the teſtimonie bore by the Apoſtles to his reſurrection and aſcenſion in their diſcourſes, and by many miracles, and various ſufferings: their preaching firſt at *Jeruſalem*, and in *Judea*, and afterwards by themſelves, or their aſſiſtants, in *Samaria*: and then to Gentils in *Judea*, and afterwards out of it, as well as to Jews: and of the converſion of *Paul*, and his preaching, miracles, labours, ſufferings, in many cities and countreys, parts of the Roman Empire, and the polite world, and at length in *Rome* itſelf.

8. If we were to indulge ourſelves in making remarks upon this uſeful and excellent performance, nothing, perhaps, would be more obſervable, than it's brevity and conciſeneſſe: by which means many things muſt have been omitted, which happened during the period of that hiſtorie. For it is very true, which *Chryſoſtom* ſaid, that (*c*) *Luke* leaves us thirſting for more. 9. Says

(*c*) *Vol. x. p. 327.*

9. Says *Le Clerc:* "*Luke*'s *(d)* Apoſtoli-
" cal Hiſtorie relates the beginings of the
" preaching of the Goſpel among Jews and
" Gentils, chiefly by the miniſtrie of *Peter*
" and *Paul.* For of the other Apoſtles he
" is almoſt entirely ſilent. . . I wiſh, ſays he,
" that ſome other apoſtolical man, of like
" judgement and integrity, had writ the hiſ-
" torie of the other Apoſtles, and had under-
" taken to ſupply what was wanting in *Luke*'s
" hiſtorie, and that this work had come down
" to us." But, however deſirable it may now appear to us, we cannot perceive from eccleſiaſtical hiſtorie, that ever ſuch a work was publiſhed.

10. *Eſtius* imagined, " that *(e) Luke*, poſ-
" ſibly, intended to write a third book, to
" ſupply,

(d) Hic vero deſinit Lucae Hiſtoria Apoſtolica, quâ initia praedicationis evangelicae apud Judaeos, Ethnicoſque, et miniſterio quidem Petri et Pauli potiſſimum ſcribere adgreſſus eſt. De ceteris Apoſtolis altum ubique apud eum eſt ſilentium. . . Utinam vero, vir quiſpiam apoſtolicus, pari judicio et fide, ceterorum res geſtas literis mandaſſet, quae narrationi Lucae deſunt ſupplere voluiſſet, idque opus ad nos perveniſſet! *Cler. H. E. An.* 61. *n. iv.*

(e) Sed proculdubio multa actorum Pauli a Luca ſunt omiſſa. . . . Ac fortaſſe Lucas meditabatur tertium librum, in quo repeteret acta illius biennii . . ſicut Act. i. quaedam expoſuit tacita ultimo capite Evangelii. *Eſt. ad Act. Ap. xxviii.* 30.

" ſupply, particularly, the omiſſions of the " two years, which St. *Paul* ſpent at *Rome*." But I verily believe, there is no ground at all for that conjectural ſuppoſition.

11. Again: *Le Clerc*, above mentioned, thinks, " that *(f) Luke* breaks off the hiſtorie of St. *Peter*, of whom he had ſaid ſo much before, very abruptly, in thoſe words, Acts xii. 17. *And he departed, and went to another place*." Neverthelefs St. *Luke* afterwards drops St. *Barnabas* in a like manner. ch. xv. 39. And in the end he will take his leave of the Apoſtle *Paul* himſelf without much more ceremonie.

12. Thoſe omiſſions are no reflexion upon the writer, nor any diſparagement to his hiſtorie. The proper deduction to be made by us is this: We hereby perceive, that it was not the deſign of St. *Luke*, to aggrandize *Peter*, or *Paul*, or any of the Apoſtles, nor to write their lives: but to record the evidences of our Saviour's reſurrection, and to write a hiſtorie of the firſt preaching and planting the Chriſtian Religion in the world. This deſign

(f) Mirum eſt, Lucam, poſtquam liberationem Petri e carcere narravit cap. xii. 17. eumque *in alium locum*, hoc eſt, extra Ieroſolymam, iviſſe dixit, ne verbulum quidem de eo habere, de quo tam multa alia dixerat. *Id. ibid.*

deſign he has admirably executed. And having filled up his plan, he concluded.

13. However, undoubtedly, many things are omitted by St. *Luke.* Some of which we may learn from St. *Paul*'s epiſtles. I ſhall obſerve ſome omiſſions.

14. St. *Luke* has not in the courſe of his hiſtorie, mentioned the writing of any of St. *Paul*'s epiſtles. It is probable, that he was at *Corinth*, when the Apoſtle wrote thence his large epiſtle to the *Romans*. Nevertheleſs he takes not any notice of it, nor of the epiſtles writ by St. *Paul* at *Rome*, when he certainly was with him, nor indeed of any other. By comparing the epiſtles themſelves, and St. *Luke*'s hiſtorie of the Apoſtle in the Acts, we are enabled to trace the time and place of divers of thoſe epiſtles. But they are no where particularly mentioned by the hiſtorian.

15. In Acts ix. 19. . . 26. St. *Luke*, after the account of St. *Paul*'s converſion, ſpeaks of his being at *Damaſcus*, and his preaching there, and of the oppoſition, which he there met with from the Jews, and his eſcape thence, and then going to *Jeruſalem*. But St. *Paul* Gal. i. 17. 18. informs us, that after his converſion he went into *Arabia*, and then returned

returned to *Damaſcus:* and that three years paſſed between his converſion and his going to *Jeruſalem.* This is an inſtructive inſtance. For the omiſſion is certain, and undoubted. I am of opinion, that St. *Luke* did not omit the journey into *Arabia*, becauſe he did not know of it: but deſignedly, and becauſe he did not judge it neceſſarie to be mentioned. *Jerome (g)* has taken particular notice of the omiſſion of that journey into *Arabia.*

16. Like omiſſions are in St. *Luke*'s Goſpel. I ſhall take notice of two.

1.) Having given the hiſtorie of our Lord's preſentation at the temple, he ſays ch. ii. 39. *And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city, Nazareth.* Nevertheleſs, I think, the holy family did not now go directly from *Jeruſalem* to *Nazareth*, but to *Bethlehem.* There, as I ſuppoſe, our Lord received the homage of the Magians. And afterwards, to avoid the perſecution of *Herod*,

(g) Lucam vero idcirco de Arabia praeteriſſe, quia forſitan nihil dignum apoſtolatu in Arabia perpetrarat: et ea potius compendioſa narratione dixiſſe: quae digna Chriſti evangelio videbantur. Nec hoc ſegnitiae Apoſtoli deputandum, ſi fruſtra in Arabia fuerit: ſed quod aliqua diſpenſatio et Dei praeceptum fuerit, ut taceret. *Hier. in Ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T.* 4. *p.* 235.

Herod, they removed thence to *Egypt*, and then returned to *Nazareth*. All which is recorded Matth. ii. 1.... 13. The viſit of the Magians muſt have been after the preſentation at the temple. If it had been before, and if they had preſented *their gifts, gold, and frankincenſe, and myrrh:* mentioned Matt. ii. 11. *Marie* would not have made the leſſer offering for her purification, mentioned Luke ii. 23. 24. Nor could the child Jeſus have been ſafely brought to *Jeruſalem*, or ſuch notice have been taken of him at the temple, as St. *Luke* particularly relates, ch. ii. 25... 38. if *Herod, and all Jeruſalem*, had been juſt before alarmed by the inquiries of the Magians: *Where is he that is born King of the Jews?* Matth. ii. 1. 2. Omitting therefore all thoſe things, St. *Luke* ſays, as above obſerved, and afterwards *they returned to Nazareth*, the place of their uſual abode. Which is agreeable to Matth. ii. 22. 23.

2.) Another thing obſervable is, that all our Saviour's appearances to his diſciples, after his reſurrection, recorded by St. *Luke* ch. xxiv. were at *Jeruſalem*, or near it. He takes not any notice of our Saviour's meeting the diſciples in *Galilee*, ſo particularly mentioned Matth. xxviii. 7. and Mark xvi. 7.

St.

St. *John* alſo ch. xxi. 1. .. 23. ſpeaks of our Saviour's ſhewing himſelf to the diſciples at *the ſea of Tiberias.* And St. *Paul* aſſures us, that our Lord was ſeen *of above five hundred brethren at once.* 1 Cor. xv. 6. Which, probably, was in the ſame countrey. And though at the begining of his book of the Acts, St. *Luke* reſumes the account of our Saviour's ſhewing himſelf to the diſciples after his reſurrection; there is nothing more about *Galilee*, than in the former relation. Inſomuch that, if we had St. *Luke*'s hiſtories only, we might have been apt to conclude, that all the appearances of our Saviour to his diſciples were at *Jeruſalem*, or near it, and no where elſe.

17. St. *Paul*'s epiſtles inform us of many things omitted by St. *Luke.* But we ſhould have known many more, if we had had a parallel hiſtorian. A compariſon of St. *Luke*'s hiſtorie of our Saviour with that of the other Evangeliſts may aſſure of this.

18. In the eleventh chapter of the ſecond epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, St. *Paul* mentions divers viſions and revelations, with which he had been favored. But St. *Luke* has not taken notice of any of them. St. *Paul* in his ſpeech to the people at *Jeruſalem*, record-

ed

ed by St. *Luke* Acts xxii. 17. mentions a tranſe, which he had in the temple. But St. *Luke* has no where told us the exact time of it. Nor has he otherwiſe mentioned it.

19. I do not think, that theſe things were omitted by St. *Luke*, becauſe St. *Paul* concealed them from him: or becauſe by ſome other means he was unacquainted with the time and place of them. But it was a regard to brevity, that induced him to paſs them over. They were not neceſſarie to be inſerted in his hiſtorie. Without them he has recorded ſufficient atteſtations of *Paul*'s apoſtolical authority, and of the truth, and divine original of the doctrine taught by him.

20. Says St. *Paul*, unwillingly, and conſtrained by the diſadvantageous inſinuations and charges of ſelf-intereſted and deſigning men. 2 Cor. xi. 23. *Are they miniſters of Chriſt?* [*I ſpeak as a fool:*] *I am more. In labours more abundant, in ſtripes above meaſure, in priſons more frequent, in deaths oft.*

In priſons more frequent. Therefore before writing this epiſtle, in the year 57. *Paul* had been impriſoned ſeveral times: though St. *Luke* has mentioned before this time one impriſonment only, which was at *Philippi*. Acts

xvi.

xvi. 23. . . 40. Upon which *Eſtius (h)* obſerves, that *Paul* did and ſuffered many things, not mentioned in the Acts. And Rom. xvi. 7. *Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinſmen, and my fellow-priſoners . . . who alſo were in Chriſt before me.* *Paul* was not a priſoner, when he wrote the epiſtle to the *Romans*, in the begining of the year 58. But *(i)* he had been in priſon before with thoſe two early Chriſtians, his relations. But where, or when, we cannot exactly ſay.

21. Ver. 24. *of the Jews five times received I forty ſtripes ſave one.* Nevertheleſs St. *Luke* has not mentioned one of thoſe times. *Eſtius* conjectures, that *(k) Luke* omitted theſe, and

(h) De Paulo autem incarcerato ante hanc epiſtolam, in Actis Apoſtolorum non legimus quidem, niſi cap. xvi. ubi a Philippenſibus in carcerem miſſus legitur. Sed permulta Paulus et fecit et paſſus eſt, quae in Actis non ſcribuntur. *Eſt. ad 2 Cor. xi.* 23.

(i) Porro concaptivos intellige, quod aliquando communia cum Paulo vincula pro Chriſto paſſi fuiſſent. Ubi tamen, aut quando factum ſit, ignoratur. *Eſt. ad Rom. xvi.* 7.

(k) Sed cur Lucas in Actis ne unius quidem flagillationis ex quinque meminit? Ideo videlicet, quod de Paulo pene ea ſola, quibus ipſe praeſens fuit, ſigillatim recenſeat: alia vero vel ſilentio pertranſeat, vel ſummatim ac breviter referat. . . Qua in re notanda humilitas Pauli, qui ſuas tot et tam graves pro Chriſto paſſiones Lucae comiti ſuo non aperuerit, ne hic quidem recitaturus, niſi coëgiſſet eum amor ſalutis Corinthiorum. *Id. ib. ad ver.* 24.

and many other things, becauſe he was not with the Apoſtle, when they happened, and *Paul* out of modeſtie forbore to tell him of them. I rather think, that *Luke* was fully acquainted with *Paul*'s hiſtorie. But he aimed at brevity, and judged the things mentioned by him to be ſufficient.

22. Ver. 25. *Thrice was I beaten with rods:* meaning, I ſuppoſe, by Roman Magiſtrates. But St. *Luke* has mentioned one inſtance only of this: which was at *Philippi*, when *Paul* and *Silas* both underwent this hard uſage. Acts xvi. 19. . . 40. Of this *(l)* likewiſe *Eſtius* has taken notice in his Commentarie.

Once was I ſtoned: undoubtedly meaning at *Lyſtra* in *Lycaonia*, as related by St. *Luke* Acts xiv. 19. 20.

Thrice I have ſuffered ſhipwreck. St. *Luke* has recorded but one inſtance, which was not untill after this time, in the Apoſtle's voyage from *Judea* to *Rome*. Acts xxvii. Which therefore muſt have been the fourth.

A night

(l) Ter virgis coeſus ſum: a Gentilibus. Erat enim Romanis conſuetudo, virgis coedere nocentes. . . Porro Lucas tantum ſemel meminit hujus contumeliae Paulo illatae: ſcilicet Act. xvi. ubi ſcribit eum una cum Sila virgis caeſum a Philippenſibus. *Eſt. in loc.*

A night and a day have I been in the deep. At one of thoſe times I eſcaped with the utmoſt difficulty, by getting on a plank, and floating in the ſea a night and a day, or a whole day of four and twenty hours.

23. Ver. 26. *In journeyings, often, in perils of waters,* or rather *rivers.* Which *(m)* are ſometimes very dangerous. But St. *Luke* has not recorded any dangers of the Apoſtle upon rivers, either in croſſing them, or ſailing upon them.

24. Says *Tillemont* in his life of St. *Paul:* "The *(n)* greateſt part of interpreters think, "that St. *Paul* made no voyages, but thoſe, "which are taken notice of in the Acts.... "Nevertheleſs we muſt neceſſarily acknow-"ledge, that beſide what St. *Luke* informs us "of the ſufferings of St. *Paul,* this Apoſtle "was five times ſcourged by the Jews, twice "beaten with rods, and thrice ſhipwrecked. "All this happened, before he wrote his ſe-"cond epiſtle to the *Corinthians:* that is, in "the time, of which St. *Luke* has writ the "hiſtorie. Nevertheleſs St. *Luke* ſays nothing

(m) Periculis fluminum: quae interdum non minus periculoſa ſunt navigantibus, quam mare. *Eſt. in loc.*

(n) Mem. Ec. T. i. St. Paul. note xviii.

" of all this. It is certain therefore, that " either he has omitted the circumſtances of " the moſt remarkable events, which he re- " lates, or that St. *Paul* made ſeveral voyages, " of which he has taken no notice."

25. The reaſon of St. *Luke*'s ſilence here I take to be the ſame that has been already aſſigned of his ſilence upon other occaſions. It was not neceſſarie, that theſe things ſhould be related. To have writ an account of all the Apoſtle's journeys, and dangers, would have rendered the work more voluminous and prolix, than was judged proper. When St. *Luke* ſet about compoſing and publiſhing this book, he had all the materials before him, and his plan was formed. Agreeably to which, he determined to write at large the hiſtorie of St. *Paul*'s voyage from *Judea* to *Rome*, in which are many remarkable incidents, and to omit ſome other of the Apoſtles journeys and voyages: though divers of them likewiſe were attended with affecting circumſtances.

26. The chapter, from which I have juſt now tranſcribed ſeveral things, concludes in this manner. ver. 31. . . . 33. *The God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who is bleſſed for evermore, knows that I lie not. In Damaſcus*

maſcus the Governour under Aretas, the King, kept the city of the Damaſcens with a garriſon, deſirous to apprehend me. And through a window in a baſket was I let down by the wall, and eſcaped his hands.

I have often reflected with great ſatisfaction on St. *Luke*'s not omitting this dangerous attempt upon the Apoſtle's liberty, and life: with which himſelf was ſo much affected, and which he has here mentioned with ſuch ſolemnity. The hiſtorie of it may be ſeen in Acts ix. 23. . . 25.

I now proceed to ſome other things.

27. St. *Paul* aſſures us Gal. ii. 1. . . 3. that when he went up to *Jeruſalem* upon occaſion of the debate concerning the manner of receiving Gentil converts, he took *Titus* with him. Which is not ſaid by St. *Luke* Acts xv. though he gives a particular account of *Paul*'s going from *Antioch* to *Jeruſalem* upon that occaſion. Nor indeed has St. *Luke* once mentioned *Titus* in his hiſtorie: though St. *Paul* wrote an epiſtle to him, and has mentioned him ſeveral times in his epiſtles, ſent to others.

28. Gal. ii. 11. . . 21. St. *Paul* ſpeaks of *Peter*'s being at *Antioch*, before he and *Barnabas* had ſeparated. But St. *Luke* ſays no-

thing of it. *Jerome*, in his Commentarie upon the epiſtle to the *Galatians*, ſays: "We *(o)* are not to wonder, that *Luke* has "taken no notice of this. For by the uſual "privilege of hiſtorians he has omitted many "things performed by *Paul*, and which we "know from himſelf."

29. Rom. xvi. 3. 4. St. *Paul* applauds an action of great generoſity in *Aquila* and *Priſcilla*. But St. *Luke* has not informed us of the place, or occaſion of it. Doubtleſs he did not omit it, for want of reſpect to thoſe excellent Chriſtians, whom he has mentioned more than once. ch. xviii. 18. and 26. But that particular did not come within the compaſſe of his deſign.

30. Many things, not expreſſly mentioned by St. *Luke*, may be argued, and concluded to have been done, from thoſe which he has recorded.

1.) In Acts iv. 23 ... 30. is recorded a prayer of the Apoſtles, in which they requeſt, that they may be enabled to work miracles for farther confirming the doctrine taught by them. And unqueſtionably, their prayer

(o) Nec mirum eſſe, ſi Lucas hanc rem tacuerit, quum et alia multa, quae Paulus ſuſtinuiſſe ſe replicat, hiſtoriographi licentiâ praetermiſerit. *In Gal. cap. ii. T. 4. p. 244.*

prayer was heard, and their requeſt granted, and they did work many miracles in the name of Chriſt, more than are related by St. *Luke*.

2.) Acts v. 12. *And by the hand of the Apoſtles were many ſigns and wonders done among the people.* And what follows. Whence it may be concluded, that *(p)* many miracles were wrought, not only by *Peter* and *John*, but alſo by the other Apoſtles alſo, beſide thoſe, which are particularly recorded. See alſo ch. ii. 43.

3.) Says Mr. *Biſcoe:* " Many *(q)* and great " miracles are related in the hiſtorie of the " Acts to be wrought by St. *Paul*, and his " fellow-laborers, in their preaching the goſ- " pel to the Gentils. And agreeably hereto " St. *Paul* ſays, 2 Cor. xii. 12. *Truly the* " *ſigns of an Apoſtle were wrought amongſt* " *you in all patience, in ſigns, and wonders,*

(p) Oecumenius ſays, that *Luke* omitted many miracles wrought by the Apoſtles for avoiding oſtentation. Πολλῶν δὲ θαυμάτων ἐπιτελουμένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὡς ἡ ἀνωτέρω ἐμνήσθη ὁ ταῦτα γράφων λουκᾶς, [cap. ii. 43.] ἐδένος ἐκείνων ὀνομασὶ μνημονέυει, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο γράφει μόνον ἀφ' ἧς πάντες ἐκινήθησαν. . . . . ἢ ἡ ὅτι ὁ κόμπος χάριν ἡ συγγραφὴ αὐτῷ αὕτη ἐσπουδάσθη. *Oecum. in Act. Cap. iii. Tom. i. p. 25. A. B.*

(q) The Hiſtory of the Acts confirmed. ch. xi. §. 8. p. 407. 408.

" *and mighty deeds.* And to the *Romans*,
" ch. xv. 18. 19. . . . . I make no doubt,
" ſays that learned writer, but the Apoſtles
" wrought miracles in every city, where
" they came with a view to preach the goſ-
" pel, and make converts. St. *Luke* is ſo
" very ſuccinct in his hiſtorie of the Acts,
" that he often omits them. He gives an ac-
" count of only a miracle or two wrought at
" *Philippi* in his whole relation of St. *Paul*'s
" journey from *Antioch* to the Weſt, when
" he converted a great part of *Macedonia* and
" *Achaia:* though it is evident from St. *Paul*'s
" own epiſtle, already quoted, that he at that
" time did many ſigns and wonders at *Corinth.*
" And that he did the ſame at *Theſſalonica*, is
" not obſcurely intimated in his firſt epiſtle
" to the *Theſſalonians.* ch. i. 5. We read
" nothing in the Acts of the Apoſtles of
" what St. *Paul* did in *Galatia* the firſt time,
" more than that he went through it. Acts
" xvi. 6. And all that is added the ſecond
" time he was there is, that *he went over all*
" *the countrey of Galatia, ſtrengthening all*
" *the diſciples.* ch. xviii. 23. Which in-
" deed is an intimation, that the firſt time
" he was there he preached the goſpel a-
" mong them, and made converts. But
" from

" from his epiſtle to the *Galatian* churches it " is fully evident, that he wrought miracles " among them, and conferred on them gifts " of the Holy Spirit. For he aſks them: " *He that miniſtreth to you the Spirit, and* " *worketh miracles among you, doth he it by* " *the works of the law, or by the hearing of* " *faith?* Gal. iii. 25. That he means " himſelf, is manifeſt from the whole tenour " of the epiſtle. See ch. i. 6. iv. 11. 13. " 14. 19."

There follow other like obſervations, which I may not tranſcribe.

4.) Mr. *Biſcoe*, as above, *makes no doubt, but the Apoſtles wrought miracles in every city, where they came, with a view to preach the goſpel, and make converts.* I am of opinion, that this may be truly ſuppoſed of *Paul*, particularly, and that it may be concluded from what St. *Luke* has writ. For, according to him, *Paul* wrought miracles in *Cyprus*. Acts xiii. 11. at *Lyſtra*. xiv. 10. at *Philippi* xvi. 16 . . 18. See alſo 25. 26. and very many at *Epheſus*. xix. 11 . . 17. And at *Troas* he raiſed *Eutychus* to life. xix. 9 . . 12. In his voyage from *Judea* to *Rome* he wrought many miracles. xxviii. 3 . . . 6. and 7 . . 10. From theſe miracles, recorded by St. *Luke*,

it may be well argued, that St. *Paul* wrought miracles in all, or moſt other places, where he went, and made any ſtay, preaching the goſpel. In particular, it may be argued, that *Paul* wrought miracles at *Athens*, and at *Rome*. What they were, we cannot ſay, becauſe they have not been recorded by St. *Luke*, nor by any other credible writer. But that miracles were performed by the Apoſtle in thoſe cities, appears to me very probable.

5.) St. *Luke (r)* has not given any account of St. *Paul*'s appearing before the Emperour *Nero* at *Rome*, when he was ſent thither by *Feſtus*. Nevertheleſs, that *Paul* was brought before *Nero* ſoon after his arrival at *Rome*, is highly probable. And though St. *Luke* has not expreſſly ſaid ſo, it may be concluded from what he has ſaid. For he has again and again ſufficiently intimated, that *Paul* was certainly to appear before the Emperour, to whom he had appealed. See Acts xxv. 10. 11. 12. 21. xxvi. 32. xxvii. 24. xxviii. 9. The Apoſtle therefore was brought before *Nero*, and pleaded before him.

(r) Mirum, quod Lucas hic nullam faciat mentionem primae defenſionis Pauli, de qua ipſe 2 Tim. iv. Quam factam fuiſſe primo anno, quo Romam venit, non dubitandum. *Eſt. ad Act. xxviii.* 30.

him. But St. *Luke* forbore to give a diſtinct account of it, becauſe he had already given a particular account of *Paul*'s pleadings before *Felix*, and *Feſtus*, and *Agrippa*. And from them may be concluded, what was the tenour of his apologie before the Emperour himſelf.

6) St. *Paul*, in his epiſtle to the Chriſtians at *Rome*, ſays, ch. i. 11. *I long to ſee you, that I may impart unto you ſome ſpiritual gift, to the end ye may be eſtabliſhed.* And ch. xv. 29. *I am ſure, that when I come unto you, I ſhall come unto you in the fulneſſe of the bleſſing of the goſpel of Chriſt.* And unqueſtionably, the event was agreeable to theſe wiſhes and expectations.

7.) St. *Luke* has not particularly recorded thoſe things in his hiſtorie. But from what he has ſaid they may be inferred. Says our hiſtorian. Acts xxviii. 13 . . 16. *And we came the next day to Puteoli. Where we found brethren, and were deſired to tarry with them ſeven days. And ſo we went toward Rome. And from thence, when the brethren heard of us, they came to meet us, as far as Appii Forum, and the Three Taverns. Whom when Paul ſaw, he thanked God, and took courage. And when he came to Rome, the Centurion*

delivered

delivered the priſoners to the Captain of the Guard. But Paul was ſuffered to dwell by himſelf, with a ſoldier that kept him. And ver. 30. *Paul dwelled two whole years in his own hired houſe.*

8.) From the things here ſaid it may be fairly concluded, that during the Apoſtle's ſtay at *Rome*, there was a very delightful communication of civil and religious offices between him and the believers there, according to the abilities, and the exigences of each. Before he left *Rome*, the *Philippians* ſeem to have ſent him a ſupplie by *Epaphroditus*. Philip. iv. 10 . . 18. But it may be well ſuppoſed, that the price of his lodging, and the expenſes of his maintenance, were provided for, chiefly, by the Chriſtians, whom he found at *Rome*, when he came thither, and by the converts, which he made afterwards. The ſoldiers likewiſe, who by turns attended upon him, would expect to be conſidered, if they carried it civilly toward their priſoner. All which, we may ſuppoſe, was taken care of by the good Chriſtians at *Rome:* who, as St. *Luke* aſſures us, went out to meet him, and conducted him into the City.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

St. John,

Apoſtle, and Evangeliſt.

I. *His Hiſtorie from the N. T.* II. *His Age.* III. *When he left Judea, to go to Epheſus.* IV. *His Hiſtorie from eccleſiaſtical Writers.* V. *The Time, when he was baniſhed into Patmos.* VI. *How long he was there.* VII. *Teſtimonies of ancient Writers to his Goſpel.* VIII. *Opinions of learned Moderns concerning the Time, when this Goſpel was writ.* IX. *An Argument, to prove, that it was writ before the Deſtruction of Jeruſalem.* X. *Objections conſidered.* XI. *Obſervations upon this Goſpel.*

His Hiſtorie from the N. T.

I. JOHN was the ſon of *Zebedee*, a fiſherman upon the ſea of *Galilee*, probably *(a)* of the town of

(a) Zebedaeum gente Galilaeum fuiſſe ex loco commorationis circa lacum Gennesareth ſuſpicamur. Incertius autem,

of *Bethſaida*, and *(b) Salome*. *John* was the younger brother. For *James* is always *(c)* mentioned firſt, except in *Luke* ix. 28. And *John* is generally reckoned the youngeſt of all Chriſt's diſciples.

Though *Zebedee* was by trade a fiſherman, he needs not be reckoned poor. For, as St. *Mark* has particularly obſerved, he was not only maſter of a boat, and nets, but had *hired ſervants*. ch. i. 20. Moreover, we may recollect what *Peter* ſaid to Chriſt, who alſo had been a fiſherman upon the ſame ſea. *We have left all, and followed thee*. Matt. xix. 27. They left their employments, by which they gained a ſubſiſtence: and for the preſent there was ſelf-denial in their attendence upon Jeſus.

It is not unlikely, that *Zebedee* died not long after theſe two brothers were called to

autem, Bethſaidenſem pronunciare, ut plerique faciunt: cum id nitatur tantum teſtimonio Evangelii, ſociis Andreae ac Petro hoc oppidum adſignantis. Neque tamen argumenta ad manus ſunt, quibus vulgatam hanc opinionem impugnemus. *Lampe Prolegom. in Johan.*

(b) Compare Matt. xxvii. 55. *with Mark xv.* 40. *and xvi.* 1.

(c) So Matt. iv. 21. *x.* 2. *Mark i.* 19. *iii.* 17. *x.* 35. *Luke v.* 10. *Act. i.* 13.

to be Apoſtles. However, the circumſtances of the familie may be collected from what is ſaid of their mother, who is mentioned, Matt. xxvii. 55. and Mark xv. 41. among *thoſe women, who followed Jeſus out of Galilee, and miniſtred unto him.* That miniſtrie is deſcribed Luke viii. 3. To which might be added, that ſhe is mentioned among thoſe women that bought ſweet ſpices to embalm the body of Jeſus. Mark xvi. 1. Luke xxiii. 55. And our Lord, having recommended his mother to this diſciple, it is ſaid, that *he took her to his own home.* John xix. 27.

If *Salome* was related to our Lord in the manner ſuppoſed by *(d) Theophylact*, or ſome other way, with which we are not diſtinctly acquainted; that may have been, in part, the ground and reaſon of ſeveral things mentioned in the Goſpels: as the petition of theſe two brothers, diſciples, for the firſt two places in Chriſt's kingdom: *John*'s being the beloved diſciple, and friend of Jeſus, and being admitted to ſome freedoms, denied to the reſt: and, poſſibly, per-

(d) *See Vol. xi. p.* 424, 425.

(e) performing ſome offices about his perſon: and, finally, our Lord's committing to him the care of his mother, ſo long as ſhe ſhould ſurvive him.

In Acts iv. 13. It is ſaid of *Peter* and *John*, that they were *ignorant, and unlearned men.* Which, indeed, is nothing elſe, but that they were neither *(f)* Doctors, nor Magiſtrates, but men of private ſtations, who had not been educated in the ſchools of the Rabbies: or, as Dr. *Doddridge* has happily tranſlated this text, *illiterate men, and in private ſtations of life.* So *Oecumenius* ſays, that

(e) Opus ſcilicet erat ipſi aliquo, quem interdum ad matrem mitteret, (quod non ita raro factum eſſe, facile intelligitur,) quo uteretur ad lavandos ſibi pedes, ad induendos ſibi et exuendos calceos. [vid. Matt. iii. 11. Marc. i. 8. Luc. iii. 16. Joan. i. 27.] qui ſibi praeſto eſſet ad mandata ſubita, qui in cubiculo ſibi adjaceret dormienti, qui alia ſibi praeſtaret minuta officiola domeſtica, qui propterea perpetuus ſibi eſſet pediſſequus, nec niſi juſſus ab ipſo recederet. *Heuman. Diſſ. Syll. Tom.* 2. *p.* 338.

(f) Ἀγράμματοι, *ſine literis:* id eſt, non verſati in doctrinis thalmudicis, quales illiterati Hebraeis. Nam ſcripturas Apoſtoli et legerant, et memoria tenebant. Καὶ ἰδιῶται. Idiotae ſunt Hebraeis, qui neque Magiſtratus ſunt, neque Legiſperiti. *Grot. in loc.*

that *(g)* St. *John* in ſending a letter to *Caius* had *Paul* for an example, who wrote to *Timothie*, and *Titus*, and to *Philemon*, an idiot: that is, a man of a private ſtation: whereas *Timothie* and *Titus* had a public character in the Church, as they were Evangeliſts.

There can be no doubt, that *Zebedee*'s ſons, as the children of all pious Jews at that time, were well acquainted with the ſcriptures of the Old Teſtament. They had read them, and had heard them read and explained in the ſynagogues. They had alſo been accuſtomed to go to *Jeruſalem*, at the feaſts, and had diſcourſed with many upon the things of religion. They now were in expectation of the appearing of the Meſſiah, foretold in the Law and the Prophets. But, undoubtedly, were in the common prejudice of the nation, that it would be, in part at leſt, a worldly kingdom. And it is very likely, that they had heard *John* preach: though they did not attend ſtatedly upon him, as his diſciples. For all the people of *Judea* in general went to *John*'s baptiſm.

Says

(g) Πρὸς δὲ γάϊον ἑνα γράφων ἔχει παῦλον τίτῳ γράφοντα ἢ τιμοθέῳ, ἢ πρὸς φιλήμονα δὲ ἰδιώτην. *Oecum. T. 2. p. 606. C.*

Says St. *John* i. 35. 36. *Again, the next day after John ſtood, and two of his diſciples. And looking upon Jeſus, as he walked, he ſaith: Behold the lamb of God* .. From ver. 40. we learn, that one of theſe two, which heard *John* ſpeak, was *Andrew, Simon Peter's brother.* And *(h)* ſome have ſuppoſed, that our Evangeliſt, who writes this, was the other. Which I do not look upon as certain, though I do not deny it.

Whether the other was *John*, or not, it ought to be reckoned unqueſtioned, that before he was called to be an Apoſtle, he had ſeen and heard the Lord Jeſus, and had been witneſſe of ſome miracles wrought by him. It appears to me very probable, that *(i)* he was one of the diſciples, who were preſent at the wedding in *Cana* of *Galilee*, where water was made wine. John ii. 1 .... 11.

The call of *James* and *John*, to attend upon Jeſus ſtatedly, is related Matt. iv. 21. 22. Mark i. 19. 20. Luke v. 1 .. 10.

St.

(h) Duorum alter ver. 41. nominatur. Alter videtur ipſe Evangeliſta noſter fuiſſe, uti viſum in vita ejus. Lib. i. cap. 2. *Lampe in Joh. cap. i. ver.* 35. 36.

(i) However, *Baſnage* diſputes this. Neque probabile admodum, Joannem his interfuiſſe nuptiis. Quod ſi concederetur, &c. *Baſn. Ann.* 30. *num. xxxviii.*

St. *Mark*, putting down the names of the twelve Apoſtles, when he mentions *James* and *John*, ſays, that our Lord *ſurnamed them Boanerges, which is ſons of thunder.* ch. iii. 17. By which it ſeems unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that our Lord intended to reproach them with ſome fault in their natural temper, as if they were fierce and furious: though *(k)* a learned writer has intimated ſo much. That *(l)* name muſt have been very honorable, prophetically repreſenting the reſolution and courage, with which they would openly and boldly declare the great truths of the goſpel, when fully acquainted with them. How *John* anſwered this character, we know from what is ſaid of him in the book of the Acts, and from his own writings, and from things recorded of him in eccleſiaſtical hiſtorie. How well *James*, the other brother, anſwered that character, may be concluded from his being beheaded by *Herod Agrippa* at *Jeruſalem*, not many years after our Lord's

(k) "However it was, our Lord, I doubt not, herein had "reſpect to the furious and reſolute diſpoſition of thoſe two "brothers, who ſeem to have been of a more fierce and fiery "temper, than the reſt of the Apoſtles." *Cave's Life of St. James the Great. num.* 5. *p.* 142.

(l) Vid. Fr. Lamp. Prolegom. l. i. cap. 2. *num. vii. . . xv.*

aſcenſion. Which, we cannot doubt, was owing to an open and ſtedfaſt teſtimonie to the reſurrection of Jeſus, and to other ſervices for the Church: whereby he had greatly ſignalized himſelf in the ſhort period of his life after our Lord's aſcenſion. Poſſibly, *(m)* he had, with a freedom, not a little offenſive, ſpoke of the calamities coming upon the Jewiſh people, if they did not repent, and believe in Jeſus, as the Chriſt: as alſo *John* the Baptiſt had declared in his preaching. Matt. iii. 7... 12. Luke iii. 17. and *Stephen* in his. Acts vi. 13. 14. *James* (A) was the firſt Martyr

(m) Accedit altera ratio, quae eos adhuc proprius ſpectabat, nempe quod in ſcopo miniſterii ſui prae ceteris Apoſtolis Baptiſtae ſimiles futuri. Nempe ſicut Baptiſta in ea totus erat, ut per tonitru praeconii ſui judicium jam tum Judaeis imminens indicaret et averteret; ita et miniſterium fratrum horum potiſſimum ad Judaeos ſpectaturum erat. Jacobus quidem ea fini poſt adſcenſionem Domini nunquam, quod ſcimus, ab Hieroſolyma diſceſſit, donec pro fide martyrium ſubiret. Hoc vero ei eveniſſe, quam maxime probabile eſt, quia invidioſa prae ceteris ejus concio fuit, periculum inſtans incredulorum ex Judaeis omni data occaſione ingeminans. &c. *Lamp. ib. l. i. cap. 2. num. xv.*

(A) It has long been the general opinion of the people of *Spain*, that this *James*, the ſon of *Zebedee*, planted the goſpel in that countrey. *Gaſpar Sanctius*, a learned *Spaniſh* Jeſuit, wrote a treatiſe in defenſe of it, beſide what he ſays in his Commentarie upon the Acts of the Apoſtles. But it is incon-

Martyr for Chriſt among the Apoſtles. And bids fair for obtaining his petition, in a higher ſenſe, than it was at firſt intended: of *ſitting on the right hand, or the left hand of Chriſt in his kingdom.* And the other brother, ſurviving all the other Apoſtles, bore the longeſt teſtimonie to the truth of the goſpel.

This account of that name is agreeable to (n) what *Grotius* ſays in his Annotations.

inconſiſtent with the hiſtorie in the Acts. None of the Apoſtles left *Judea* ſo ſoon. Nor is this opinion founded on the teſtimonie of any ancient writers, of good credit. And it is now generally given up, even by Popiſh writers. *Vid. Baron. A. D.* 41. *num. i. Tillemont S. Jacques Le Majeur, et note vi. Mem. Ec. Tom. i.* I tranſcribe here the Judgement of *Eſtius*. Deinde, quando occiſus eſt, vixdum coeperat evangelium gentibus praedicari, ut ex praecedentibus et ſequentibus patet. Nec dum Apoſtoli diſperſi erant in remotas gentes: ſed ejus rei commodum tempus exſpectabant. Denique nullus ſcriptor antiquus certae fidei refert, Jacobum Hiſpanias vidiſſe. *Eſt. in Act. Ap. Cap. xii. ver. 2.* —— *Vid. et Baſnag. Ann.* 44. *num. iv. v. et Dictionaire de Moreri. S. Jacques le Majeur.*

(n) Omnino mihi videtur Chriſtus, in hujus nominis impoſitione reſpexiſſe ad Aggaei vaticinium. cap. ii. 7. . . Quod de evangelii praedicatione exponit Scriptor ad Hebraeos. xii. 26. Ad hanc ergo maximam rerum mutationem ſignificat Chriſtus, zebedaei filios eximios ſibi miniſtros fore. Et certe deſtinatam illis excellentiam quandam inter ipſos Apoſtolos vel hoc oſtendit, quod cum Petro ſeorſim a ceteris mul-

But Dr. *Heumann (o)* has another thought. He obſerves, that *Simon*, to whom Jeſus gave the name of *Peter*, is often ſo called. But we do not read, that the two ſons of *Zebedee* were any where elſe ſpoken of by the name *Boanerges*, either by themſelves or others. He thinks, that the words ſhould be thus rendred: *And he had ſurnamed them Boanerges:* that is, upon a particular occaſion he ſo called them. That occaſion *(q)* he ſuppoſes to be the hiſtorie related Luke ix. 52. . . 56. That is an ingenious conjecture. But if this name had been given them in the way of reproof and cenſure, as Chriſt once called *Peter* Satan. Mat. xvi. 23. Mark viii. 33. one would ſcarcely expect to ſee it here. The place, as ſeems to me, leads us to think, the name

multarum rerum teſtes ſunt aſſumti. Adde, quod Jacobus primus Apoſtolorum omnium ſanguine ſuo Chriſti doctrinam obſignavit, et quod Johannes omnibus Apoſtolis ſuperſtes diutiſſime teſtimonium perhibuit veritati. *Grot. ad Marc. iii.* 17.

(o) Nova Sylloge Diſſert. Part. i. p. 254. . . 259.

(q) Legimus, et adverſus Petrum indigne ſe gerentem, in haec verba erupiſſe Chriſtum: Apage, Satana. Jam uti Satanas non factum eſt ordinarium Petri cognomen, ſic nec Zebedaei fratres niſi ſemel nominati ſunt Boanerges. Nec proinde laudis hoc nomen eſt, (quae quidem inveterata eſt opinio,) ſed nomen vitii. Non eſt, inquam, appellatio honorifica, ſed invectiva. *Ib. p.* 259.

name honorable, as well as *Peter*. Which has been the general opinion of all times.

In *Suicer*'s Theſaurus, at the word Βροντή may be ſeen the obſervations of many ancient writers upon this name. I take *Theophylact*'s only. Who ſays, that *(r)* when Chriſt called theſe two diſciples ſons of thunder, he intimated, that they would be great preachers, and eminent divines.

From the time they were called by Chriſt, they ſtatedly attended upon him. They heard his diſcourſes, and ſaw his miracles.

They were two of the Twelve, whom *(s)* Chriſt ſent forth upon a commiſſion, to preach in the land of *Iſrael*. Which was of great uſe to them. Thereby *(t)* they learned to truſt in God, and were prepared for the greater difficulties of their Apoſtleſhip afterwards.

John addreſſed himſelf to Chriſt, ſaying: *Maſter, we ſaw one caſting out demons in thy name. And we forbad him, becauſe he followeth not with us*... So in Luke ix. 49. 50. And more at large in Mark ix. 38...41. But it

(r) Οἱὸς δὲ βροντῆς ὀνομάζει τὸς τῦ ζεδεδαίυ, ὡς μεγαλοκήρυκας κὴ θεολογιτάτυς. *In Marc. Tom. i. p.* 205. *C.*

(s) See Matt. x. 46. *Mark. vi.* 7. *Luke ix.* 1.

(t) See Luke xxii. 35.

was a thing, in which ſeveral were concerned. For *John* ſays: *We ſaw one caſting out demons, in thy name. And we forbad him.* The hiſtorie, as recorded by the Evangeliſts, led me to think ſo. And Mr. *Lampe (u)* was of the ſame mind. Moreover, it might be done ſome while before.

Our Lord was going from *Galilee*, to *Jeruſalem* before the feaſt of Tabernacles, as ſome think, or before the feaſt of the Dedication, as *(x)* Dr. *Doddridge* argues. And, as he was to paſs through the countrey of *Samaria*, *he ſent meſſengers before his face. And they went, and entred into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. But they did not receive him, becauſe his face was, as though he would go unto Jeruſalem. When his diſciples, James and John, ſaw this, they ſaid: Lord, wilt thou, that we command fire to come down from heaven, and conſume them, even as Elias did. But he turned, and rebuked them, and ſaid: Ye know not, what manner of ſpirit ye are of. . . . And they went to another village.* Luke ix. 51. . . 56. Some have been of opinion, that the meſſengers ſent

(u) Ubi ſupr. l. i. cap. 2. num. 18.
(x) Family-Expoſitor. Vol. ii. p. 183.

ſent by our Lord, to prepare entertainment for him, were theſe two diſciples. If ſo, this propoſal might be ſuſpected to proceed as much from reſentment of an injurious treatment of themſelves, as of their maſter. But to me that is not certain. I rather think, that thoſe meſſengers were different perſons. So *(y)* likewiſe argues Mr. *Lampe*.

The two brothers, *James* and *John*, were ambitious of high poſts of honour and dignity in Chriſt's kingdom: which, with others, they eſteemed to be of a worldly nature. The petition was preſented by their mother, but at their inſtigation. And they ſeem to have been preſent at the ſame time. For our Lord's anſwer is directed to them. Matt. xx. 20. . . 23. Mark x. 35. . . 40.

The two brothers, *James* and *John*, and *Peter*, were the only diſciples that were admitted to be preſent with our Lord at the

(y) Cui tamen in eo non accedimus, quod filios Zebedaei ipſos illos legatos putat fuiſſe, quos Ieſus in vicum Samaritanorum hoſpitium rogaturos miſerat. Unde ob illatam ſibi injuriam videntur exacerbati eſſe, ſed textus legatos illos a filiis Zebedaei ſatis clare diſtinguit. Accedit, quod Ieſus ad illos τραφεὶς converſus fuerit. Quod indicat, illos, cum Domino conſilium proponerent, non fuiſſe Domino obvios, ſed pone eum ſequentes. *Lampe Proleg. l. 1. cap. 2. n. xix. not. (b).*

raiſing of the daughter of *Jairus*. Mark v. 37. Luke viii. 51. The ſame three diſciples were taken up by Chriſt into the mount, when he was transformed in a glorious manner, and Moſes and Elias appeared, talking with him. Matt. xvii. 1. Mark ix. 2. Luke ix. 28. The ſame three were admitted to be preſent at our Lord's devotions in the garden, when he retired from the reſt. But they all failed to watch with their Lord, as he had deſired. Matt. xxvi. 36. . 45. Mark xiv. 32. . . . 42.

Says St. *Mark* xiii. 1. 2. *And as he went out of the temple, one of his diſciples ſaith unto him: Maſter, ſee what manner of ſtones, and what buildings are here. And Jeſus anſwering ſaid unto him: Seeſt thou theſe great buildings! There ſhall not be left one ſtone upon another, that ſhall not be thrown down.* Compare Matt. xxiv. 1. 2. It follows in *Mark* xiii. 3. 4. *And as he ſat on the mount of olives, over againſt the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, aſked him privatly: Tell us, when ſhall theſe things be? and what ſhall be the ſign, when all theſe things ſhall be fulfilled?* Whereby we perceive, that to thoſe four diſciples, eſpecially, our Lord addreſſed himſelf, when he delivered the predictions con-

concerning the great deſolation, coming upon the Jewiſh People, recorded in that chapter, and in Matth. xxiv. and Luke xxi.

This Apoſtle and *Peter* were the two diſciples, whom Jeſus ſent to prepare for eating his laſt paſſover. Luke xxii. 8. Compare Matt. xxvi. 17...19. Mark xiv. 13...16.

Our Lord, ſitting at ſupper with his diſciples, ſaid: *One of you will betray me. Peter* beckoned to *John*, who leaned on the boſom of Jeſus, *that he would aſk, who it ſhould be, of whom he ſpake.* Which he did. And our Lord gave him a ſign, by which he might know, whom he intended. John xiii. 21...26. This is an inſtance of the freedom, which *John* might take, as the beloved diſciple, and friend of Jeſus.

When our Lord was apprehended by the Jewiſh officers, we are informed by St. *Mark.* xiv. 51. 52. *And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth caſt about his naked body. And the young men laid hold of him. And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them.* Some have thought, that this young man was *John*. *Cave (z)* gives a good deal of

(z) "Indeed upon our Lord's firſt apprehenſion, he fled after the other Apoſtles: it not being without ſome probabilities

of countenance to that ſuppoſition. Others *(a)* have thought him to be *James*, the Lord's brother. But *Grotius*, and juſtly, wonders, that *(b)* any ſhould have been of opinion, that he was one of the Apoſtles.

That *Peter* followed our Lord at a diſtance, and was admitted into the Hall of the Jewiſh High-Prieſt, we are aſſured from all the Goſpels. It has been ſuppoſed by many, that *John* ſhewed the like teſtimonie of affection and reſpect for his Lord. For he ſays ch. xviii. 15. *And Simon Peter followed Jeſus. And ſo did another diſciple. That diſciple was known to the High-Prieſt. And ſpake to her that kept the door, and brought in Peter.*

Nevertheleſs it may be queſtioned, whether St. *John* hereby intends himſelf. *Chryſoſtom*

bilities of reaſon, that the ancients conceive him to have been that *young man*, that followed after Chriſt, *having a linen cloth caſt about his naked body:* whom when the officers laid hold upon, he left the linen cloth, and fled naked away." *Cave's Life of St. John, num. ii. p.* 151.

(a) See Whitby upon Mark xiv. 51.

(b) Non de Apoſtolorum grege. Quod miror, veteribus in mentem venire potuiſſe. Nec e domo, in quam Chriſtus in urbe diverterat, ſed ex villa aliqua horto proxima, ſtrepitu militum excitatus, et ſubito accurrens, ut conſpiceret, quid agerent. *Grot. ad Marc. xiv.* 51.

Joſtom (c) ſuppoſeth him to be meant, and that St. *John* concealed his name ont of humility and modeſtie. To the like purpoſe alſo *(d) Theophylact.* Nor *(e)* had *Jerome* any doubt here. But *Auguſtin (f)* was cautious in ſaying, who it was: though he thought it might be *John.*

Let us now obſerve the ſentiments of moderns. *Whitby* upon the place ſays: "He "ſeems not to be *John.* For he being a Ga-"lilean, as well as *Peter*, they might equally "have ſuſpected him upon that account." However, to this it might be anſwered, that *John* being known to the High-Prieſt, he was

(c) Τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής; Ὁ ταῦτα γράψας. κ. λ. *Chr. in Joan. hom.* 83. *al.* 82. *T.* 8. *p.* 491.

(d) Τίς ἦν ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής; Αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ ταῦτα γράψας· ἀποκρύπτει ἑαυτὸν διὰ ταπεινοφροσύνην. κ. λ. *Theoph. in Joh. xviii. p.* 809.

(e) Unde et Ieſus Joannem Evangeliſtam amabat plurimum. Qui propter generis nobilitatem erat notus Pontifici, et Judaeorum inſidias non timebat: in tantum ut Petrum introduceret in atrium, et ſtaret ſolus Apoſtolorum ante crucem, matremque Salvatoris in ſua reciperet. *Ad Princip. virg. ep.* 96. *al.* 16. *T.* 4. *p.* 780.

(f) Quiſnam iſte ſit diſcipulus, non temere affirmandum eſt, quia tacetur. Solet autem ſe idem Joannes ita ſignificare, et addere, quem diligebat Ieſus. Fortaſſis ergo hic ipſe eſt. Quiſquis tamen ſit, ſequentia videamus. *In Joann. Evang. Tr.* 113. *T.* 3. *P.* 2.

was ſafe. But then another difficulty will ariſe. For it may be ſaid: How came *John* to be ſo well known to the High-Prieſt, and his familie, as to be able to direct the ſervant to admit a ſtranger, as *Peter* was, and at that time of night?

Grotius likewiſe thought, that *(g)* this *other diſciple* could not be *John*, or any one of the Twelve, but rather ſome believer, an inhabitant of *Jeruſalem*, and, poſſibly, the perſon, at whoſe houſe our Lord had eat the paſchal ſupper.

Lampe (h) heſitates. And at length allegeth

(g) Et ſane non eſt probabile, aut ipſum Johannem hic intelligi: (cur enim Galilaeus cum eſſet, minus interrogaretur ab adſtantibus, quam Petrus?) aut aliquem ex Duodecim, ſed alium quendam Hieroſolymitanum, non aeque manifeſtum fautorem Ieſu: quales multi erant in urbe, ut ſupra didicimus. xii. 42. Valde mihi ſe probat conjectura exiſtimantium, hunc eſſe eum, in cujus domo Ieſus coenaverat, ob id quod legitur. Matt. xxvi. 18. *Grot. ad Joh. xviii.* 15.

(h) Scripſeram haec, cum J. Caſp. Merhenii Obſervat. Crit. in Paſſ. J. C. conſulens, novam ab eo hypotheſin proponi deprehenderem, . . . quae notatu non indigna eſt. Ipſum ſiquidem Judam proditorem pro hoc diſcipulo habet, quem Joannes nominatu poſt turpiſſimum proditionis crimen indignum cenſuit. . . . Id autem quod potiſſimum in rem ſpectare videtur, neque a noſtra ſententia, quam de conſilio Judae in prodendo ſervatore fovemus, abludit, ita habet: *Judam*

legeth the ſentiment of a learned writer, who conjectured, that this *other diſciple* was *Judas*, the traitor. For *Judas*, he thinks, was ſoon touched with remorſe for what he had done. And he might follow Jeſus to the High-Prieſt's, hoping, that by ſome means he might eſcape out of the hands of thoſe, to whom he had betrayed him. *Judas* being there himſelf, might be very willing to let in *Peter*. Whether this conjecture be ſpecious, or not, I cannot ſay. But it does not ſeem to me very likely, that St. *John* ſhould characteriſe *Judas*, by the title of *another diſciple*, after he had betrayed his Lord and Maſter.

After all, I am not able to determine this point. At firſt reading this place of St. *John*, we are naturally enough led to think, that by *the*

Judam poſt commiſſum ſcelus pudore ſuffuſum pedetentim cohortem ſuiſſe ſecutum, atque in Petrum ita incidiſſe, cui ſcelus ſuum excuſare, quin negare potuit, ſe ea mente Chriſto oſculum dediſſe, ut Chriſtum proderet, ſed ut periculum imminens ei ſubindicaret. Nos ſane de eo vix dubitamus, Judam poenitentiâ ſceleris jam tum fuiſſe tactum, atque conſcientiae ſtimulis ea propter agitatum facile potuiſſe eo conſilio Ieſum captum ſequi, ut reſciret, annon aliquâ ratione, pro ſolito, Ieſus manus captorum evaſurus eſſet. Liberam jam lectori optionem relinquimus. *Lampe in Evang. Joann. cap. xviii. Tom.* 3. *p.* 523. *not. (f).*

the other diſciple ſhould be meant himſelf. But upon farther conſideration there ariſe difficulties, that may induce us to heſitate.

Whether he followed Jeſus to the Hall of *Caiaphas*, or not, we are aſſured, that he attended the crucifixion, and ſeems to have been the only one of the Twelve, that did ſo.

John xix. 25. . . 27. *Now there ſtood by the croſſe of Jeſus his mother... When Jeſus therefore ſaw his mother, and the diſciple ſtanding by, whom he loved, he ſaith unto his mother: Woman, behold thy ſon. Then ſaith he to the diſciple: Behold thy mother. And from that hour that diſciple took her unto his own home.* There might be ſeveral reaſons for that determination: as *John*'s being a relation, the ſweetneſſe of his temper, and his having ſomewhat of his own. He had been the beloved diſciple, or friend of Jeſus. And therefore was the moſt proper to be thus truſted. And doubtleſs this deſignation was perfectly agreeable to our Lord's mother.

John ſaw his Lord expire on the croſſe. And ſtill farther. *One of the ſoldiers with a ſpear pierced his ſide. And forthwith came thereout bloud and water. And he that ſaw*

it

it bore witneſſe. And his record is true. ch. xix. 34. 35.

And undoubtedly he alſo ſtaid afterwards, and ſaw the body of Jeſus laid in the ſepulchre, and the ſtone placed at the mouth of it: as related by himſelf. xix. 38. . . 42. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 53. . . 60. Mark xv. 45. . . 47. Luke xxiii. 50. . . 56.

Early in the morning, on which our Lord roſe from the dead, *Marie Magdalen*, and other women, came to the ſepulchre, and ſaw that it was open, the ſtone having been taken away. *Marie Magdalen* knowing where ſhe could find the two Apoſtles, *Peter* and *John*, went back to the city, and told them, that *they had taken away the Lord out of the ſepulchre: and*, ſays ſhe, *we know not where they have laid him. So they ran both together, to the ſepulchre.* And by what they ſaw there, they were led to the perſuaſion, that Jeſus was riſen from the dead. As related John xx. 1. . . 10.

John was preſent with the other diſciples, when Jeſus ſhewed himſelf to them in the evening of the day, on which he aroſe, and likewiſe eight days after. ch. xx. 19. . . 29.

He

He has alſo particularly related the hiſtorie of our Lord's ſhewing himſelf to ſeveral diſciples at the ſea of *Tiberias:* when they had an extraordinarie draught of fiſhes, in number one hundred and fifty three. There were preſent at that time *Simon Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, the ſons of Zebedee, and two other diſciples.* ch. xxi. 1 . . 23. Beſide other things, which I omit, our Lord having had diſcourſe with *Peter,* and having foretold his martyrdom: *Peter* put to him a queſtion, concerning *John,* ſaying: *Lord, what ſhall this man do? Jeſus ſaith unto him: If I will, that he tarry, till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this ſaying abroad among the brethren, that that diſciple ſhould not die. Yet Jeſus ſaid not unto him: He ſhall not die. But if I will, that he tarry, till I come, what is that to thee?* Thus checking, as I apprehend, *Peter*'s curioſity. However, it has been ſuppoſed by judicious Commentators, that here is an intimation, that *John* ſhould not die before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem.* Nor is there any doubt, but he ſurvived that event, which few or none of the other Apoſtles did.

did. Though *(i)* our Lord's words may be underſtood to contain only an obſcure intimation, that whereas *Peter*'s days would be ſhortened by martyrdom, this diſciple ſhould be preſerved, till he died in the ordinarie courſe of nature.

From all which we perceive, that *(k)* St. *John* was preſent at moſt of the things related by him in his Goſpel: and that he was

(i) Ita obſcure ſignificat, Johannem, non, ut Petrum morte violenta moriturum, ſed tali, quâ, ſine hominum vi ſolveretur, ubi Chriſtus tempus idoneum judicaſſet. Quod et contigit, ut Veterum plures conſentiunt. *Grot. ad Joan. xxi.* 22.

(k) Ex ipſa hiſtoria evangelica Joannis probabile fit, omnibus eventibus, itineribus, miraculis, concionibus ſervatoris noſtri ipſum interfuiſſe . . . cum probabile fit, illum fuiſſe inter diſcipulos duos Joannis Baptiſtae, a quibus collectionis diſcipulorum initium Jeſus fecit, uti L. i. cap. 2. §. ii. oſtendimus, inde colligimus, Evangeliſtam noſtrum ſtatim ab initio rebus, quae ſcribit, interfuiſſe, et hanc eſſe veram rationem, cur non altius filum hiſtoriae ſuae inciperet. Ex omnibus quoque ſequentibus narrationibus nulla eſt, in qua abſentem Evangeliſtam noſtrum ſtatuamus fuiſſe, niſi forte excipere velis illa, quae in palatio Annae et Caiaphae acciderunt. Cap. xviii. 13. . . 17. De quibus tamen res eſt dubia, quia definiri accurate nequit, annon diſcipulus, qui Petrum in Palatium Caiaphae introduxerit, ipſe Evangeliſta noſter fuerit. Sed licet illa praeſens non percepérit, a Petro tamen, ſocio intimo, ſtatim proculdubio audivit. Et forte per ejus relationem

was an eye and ear-witneſſe of our Lord's labours, journeyings, diſcourſes, miracles, his low abaſement even to an ignominious death, and his being alive again, and then aſcending to heaven.

Having *(l)* been preſent with the reſt of the Apoſtles at the Lord's aſcenſion, he *(m)* returned with them from mount *Olivet* to *Jeruſalem*, and continued with them, joyning with them in their devotions, and in the choice of another, to ſupply the place of *Judas:* and *(n)* partook in the plentiful effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt upon the Apoſtles and their companie on the day of Pentecoſt next enſuing.

Peter and *John*, who often accompanied each other, healed the lame man at the temple, and upon that occaſion preached to the people, who aſſembled about them. For which they were brought before the Jewiſh

lationem excitatus eſt, ut ad Praetorium Pilati ſummo mane advolaret, atque ita cum reliquis mulieribus Jeſum ad crucem ſequeretur... Ex quo patet, quanta cum emphaſi prae ceteris Apoſtolis et Evangeliſtis dicere potuit: Quae audivimus, quae vidimus. 1 Jo. i. 1. 2. *Lamp. Proleg. l.* 2. *cap.* 4. *num.* vi.

(l) Mark xvi. 19. *Luke xxiv.* 50. . . . 53. *Acts i.* 1. . . . 12.

(m) Acts i. 12. . . 26.

(n) Acts ii. 1. . . 13.

Jewiſh Council, and after ſome debates were diſmiſſed with orders, not to preach any more in the name of Jeſus. Acts iii. and iv. 1...22.

Some while after this, the number of believers ſtill encreaſing in *Jeruſalem*, *John* and the reſt of the Apoſtles were apprehended, and put into the common priſon. But they were the ſame night delivered by an angel, who commanded them to *go and ſpeak in the temple to the people.* Which they did *early in the morning.* Whereupon they were again taken up, and brought before the Council, who conſulted how they might put them to death. But by the advice of *Gamaliel* that deſign was laid aſide. *And when they had beaten them, they commanded, that they ſhould not ſpeak in the name of Jeſus, and let them go. Whereupon the Apoſtles departed from the preſence of the Council, rejoycing... And daily in the temple, and from houſe to houſe, they ceaſed not to teach and preach Jeſus Chriſt.*

Afterwards, there being a violent perſecution at *Jeruſalem*, many were ſcattered abroad. *Philip*, one of the ſeven, went down to *Samaria*, and preached to them, and wrought many miracles, inſomuch that

great numbers believed. When the Apoſtles, who were at *Jeruſalem*, heard of this, they ſent unto them *Peter* and *John*, that they might receive the Holy Ghoſt. Having performed that ſervice, they returned to *Jeruſalem*. And in their way preached the goſpel in many villages of the *Samaritans*. Acts viii. 5. . . 25.

From what St. *Paul* ſays in the ſecond chapter of the epiſtle to the *Galatians* we perceive, that *John* was preſent at the Council of *Jeruſalem:* of which an account is given Acts xv. Which Council was held in the year 49. or 50. or thereabout. And it may be reckoned probable, that till that time *John* had ſtaid in the land of *Iſrael*, and had not been abroad in any Gentil countreys.

I would add, that though no miracles are related to be done by St. *John*, beſide thoſe, which have been here taken notice of; I reckon it very probable, that many miracles, beſide thoſe particularly mentioned by the hiſtorian, were wrought by him, and other Apoſtles, during their ſtay in *Judea*. This may be inferred from general expreſſions of St. *Luke* in ſeveral places. *And many ſigns and wonders were done by the Apoſtles.* Acts ii. 43.

43. *And with great power gave the Apoſtles witneſſe of the reſurrection of the Lord Jeſus.* ch. iv. 33. *And by the hands of the Apoſtles were many ſigns and wonders wrought among the people.* ch. v. 12. Comp. iv. 29. 30.

From the book of the Revelation. ch. i. 9. we learn, that St. *John* was for a while in the iſland called *Patmos*, where he was favored with viſions and revelations.

Thus far we have endeavored to collect the hiſtorie of this Apoſtle from the New Teſtament.

II. From eccleſiaſtical hiſtorie we learn, that St. *John* lived to a great Age, and that in the later part of his life he reſided in *Aſia*, particularly at *Epheſus*, the chief city of that countrey. *His Age.*

Concerning his abode in *Aſia* we have divers teſtimonies of good credit. *Irenaeus* in (*o*) two places of his work againſt Hereſies, both (*p*) cited by *Euſebe*, ſays, that *John* the Apoſtle lived in *Aſia* till the time of *Trajan*. [Who ſucceded *Nerva* in the year

(*o*) *Iren. adv. Haer. l.* 2. *cap.* 22. *n. v. p.* 148. *ed. Maſſ. et l.* 3. *cap.* 3. *p.* 178.

(*p*) *Euſeb. H. E. l.* 3. *cap.* 23. *in.*

of Chriſt 98.] *Euſebe (q)* underſtands *Clement* of *Alexandria* to ſpeak to the like purpoſe. *Origen* alſo ſays, that *(r) John* having lived long in *Aſia*, died at *Epheſus*. *Polycrates*, Biſhop of *Epheſus* about 196. is an unexceptionable witneſſe, that *(s) John* was buried in that city. *Jerome (t)* in his book of Illuſtrious Men, and in his books againſt *Jovinian*, ſays, "that the Apoſtle *John* lived in *Aſia*, to the time of *Trajan*. And dying at a great age, in the ſixty-eighth year after our Lord's paſſion, was buried near the city of *Epheſus*." Suppoſing our Lord to have been crucified in the year 32. of the vulgar æra, which *(u)* ſeems to have been *Jerome*'s opinion, ſixty eight years will reach to the year 100. or the third of *Trajan*. At which year of that Emperour the death of St. *John* is placed by *Jerome* in his *(x)* Chronicle.

What was *John*'s age, when called by Chriſt, we are not informed. *Baronius (y)* thought

(q) *Vid. Euſeb. Ibid.*
(r) *Ap. Euſeb. l. 3. cap. 1.*
(s) *Ap. Euſeb. l. v. cap. 24. in.*
(t) *See Credib. Vol. x. p.* 100. *and* 101.
(u) *Vid. Baſnag. Ann.* 101. *num. ii.*
(x) *P.* 165. *ex ed. Scalig.*
(y) *Ann.* 101. *num. ix.*

thought he might then be about 22 years of age. Having been with Chriſt three years, he was about 25 years of age when our Lord was crucified. *Tillemont (z)* ſuppoſes St. *John* to have been about 25 or 26 years of age when called to be an Apoſtle. *Lampe (a)* thinks, that he was about the ſame age with our Saviour. For my part, I cannot perſuade my-ſelf, that any of Chriſt's Apoſtles, when called to attend upon him, that they might be his witneſſes to the world, were much under the age of thirty. If it hence follows, that *John* was a hundred years of age, or thereabout, when he died, it is not at all incredible, nor unlikely.

When he left Judea.

III. As it is an allowed point, that *John* dwelt in *Aſia* in the later part of his life; we may be reaſonably deſirous to know, when he ſettled in that countrey. And for determining this, the books of the New Teſtament may afford good hints. For *(b)* in all

(z) *S. Jean. l' Evangeliſte. art. x. et note xv. Mem. Tom. i.*

(a) Quare nihil impedit, quo minus ejuſdem ferme aetatis cum ſervatore noſtro fuerit. *Prolegom. in Jo. l. i. cap. 2. num. i. not. (a).*

(b) "In the diviſion of provinces, which the Apoſtles made

St. *Luke*'s hiſtorie of the preaching and travels of *Paul*, particularly in *Aſia*, no mention is made of *John*. Which may induce us to think, that he was not there at that time. Nor are there any ſalutations ſent to *John* in any of St. *Paul*'s epiſtles, writ at *Rome:* ſeveral of which were ſent to *Epheſus*, or other places, not very remote from it: as the epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, the ſecond epiſtle to *Timothie*, probably, at *Epheſus*, the epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, and the epiſtle to *Philemon*, at *Coloſſe*.

I will now obſerve the opinions of ſome learned moderns. *Baronius* thought, that (*c*) this Apoſtle did not come to reſide in *Aſia*, until after the death of St. *Peter*, and St. *Paul*. *Du Pin* ſays: We (*d*) do not exactly know, when he came into *Aſia*. Perhaps it was about the year 70. *Tillemont* was of opinion, that (*e*) St. *John* did not come to

made among themſelves, *Aſia* fell to his ſhare, though he did not preſently enter into his charge. Otherwiſe, we muſt have heard of him in the account, which St. *Luke* gives of St. *Paul*'s ſeveral journeys into, and reſidence in thoſe parts." *Cave's Life of St. John*, §. *iv.*

(*c*) *A. d.* 97. *num. ii.*

(*d*) *Du Pin Diſſ. Prel. l.* 2. *ch.* 2. §. *vi.*

(*e*) *St. Jean art. iv.*

to reſide in *Aſia*, till about the year 66. But he ſuppoſeth, that upon ſome occaſion, he had before that been in that countrey, without making a ſtay there. Which laſt, as I apprehend, is ſaid without any good authority. Mr. *Lampe* was of opinion, that *(f) John* did not leave *Judea*, till after the death of *James*, called the Leſs, and but a ſhort time only, before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*.

To me it ſeems not unlikely, that St. *John* came into *Aſia*, about the time that the war broke out in *Judea*, in the year 66. or a ſhort time before, when, probably, St. *Peter* and *Paul* had been before crowned with martyrdom.

As St. *John* ſtaid a good while in *Paleſtine*, it may be reaſonably concluded, that the virgin *Marie* did not go with him to *Epheſus*, as *(g) Baronius*, and ſome others have thought, but died, before he went thither. Which was

(f) Poſt ejus *(Jacobi Minoris)* exceſſum neminem ex τῶν δώδεκα grege et conſtantius et diutius Hieroſolymis ſubſtitiſſe noſtro Apoſtolo: ita ut vix exiguo ante exordium intervallo, inde ſe avelli pateretur. *Proleg. l. i. cap. 2. n. xv. p.* 29.

(g) A. d. 44. *n. xxix.*

was the opinion of *(h) Cave*, and *(i) Baſnage*.

His Hiſtorie from other Writers.

IV. St. *John* having had a long life, many things have been ſaid of him, ſome true, others falſe. Moſt of them have been already taken notice of in ſeveral chapters of this work. It may not be improper to recollect them here, with ſome remarks.

1. *Apollonius*, who wrote againſt the *Montaniſts*, and flouriſhed about the year 211. ſays, in a fragment, preſerved by *Euſebe*, "That (*k*) by the divine power *John* raiſed up a dead man to life at *Epheſus*." Which miracle is alſo taken notice of by (*l*) *Sozomen*, and (*m*) *Nicephorus*, and may have been really done. But if we had had a more circumſtantial hiſtorie of it, and if it had been mentioned by ſome other early writers, beſide *Apollonius*, it would have been more credible.

2. There was a book forged with the title of the *Travels of Paul and Thecla* by a Preſ-

(*h*) "Probable therefore it is, that he dwelt in his own houſe at *Jeruſalem*, at leſt till the death of the bleſſed Virgin." *Cave's Life of St. John*, §. *iv.*

(*i*) *Vid. Baſnag. An.* 46. *num. xxxviii.*

(*k*) *See ch.* 31. *num. iv. Vol. iii. p.* 16.

(*l*) *Soz. l.* 7. *cap.* 27. *p.* 750.

(*m*) *Niceph. l.* 4. *cap.* 25.

a Preſbyter, who was depoſed for ſo doing, as related by *Tertullian*. *Jerome* ſays, that he was a Preſbyter in *Aſia*, and that he was convicted before St. *John* of being the author of it, and for that reaſon was depoſed. Of this matter we have already ſpoken diſtinctly already, and therefore refer to what was then (*n*) ſaid.

3. It is alſo related of our Apoſtle, that going to bathe at *Epheſus*, and perceiving, that *Cerinthus*, or, as others ſay, *Ebion*, was already in the bath, he came out again haſtly, and would not make uſe of the bath. The probability of which account was examined (*o*) formerly.

4. It is ſaid, that by order of the Emperour *Domitian* St. *John* was caſt into a caldron of boyling oyl at *Rome*, and came out again, without being hurt. The (*p*) truth of which ſtorie likewiſe has been conſidred by us.

5. *Poly-*

(*n*) *See ch.* 27. *vol. ii. p.* 641.... 643. *and ch.* 29. *p.* 698. *&c.*

(*o*) *See ch.* 6. *vol. i. p.* 190. 191. *note* (B) *the ſecond edition, and ch.* 114. *vol. x. p.* 108.

(*p*) *See ch.* 27. *vol. ii. p.* 604. *note* (E) *the ſecond edition, and ch.* 114. *vol. x. p.* 108.

5. *Polycrates*, Biſhop of *Epheſus* in the later part of the ſecond centurie, ſays, that *John* was Chriſt's High-Prieſt, wearing on his forehead a golden plate. Which account *(q)* has been conſidred, and the judgements of divers learned men upon it alleged.

6. *Euſebe* has a ſtorie, from a work of *Clement* of *Alexandria*, of a young man in a city of *Aſia*, not far from *Epheſus*, who after having been inſtructed in the Chriſtian Religion took to evil courſes, and became profligate: but nevertheleſs was afterwards brought to repentance by our Apoſtle. This account is inſerted at large by *Euſebe* (*r*) in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie. It has been repeated in like manner by *Simeon Metaphraſtes* in his Life of St. *John*. *Chryſoſtom (s)* has referred to it. It is alſo briefly told in the (*t*) Paſchal Chronicle. I have already taken ſome notice of this (*u*) ſtorie. *S. Baſnage (x)* thinks it to be a fable, or feigned apologue,

(*q*) *See ch.* 114. *vol. x. p.* 104. . . 107.
(*r*) *L.* 3. *cap.* 23.
(*s*) *Ad Theodor. Lapſ. T. i. p.* 31. *ed. Bened.*
(*t*) *Chr. Paſch. p.* 251. *D.*
(*u*) *See ch.* 114. *vol. x. p.* 107. 108.
(*x*) Apologo quam hiſtoriae videtur eſſe propior. . . .

Ac

apologue, compoſed to convey uſeful inſtruction. Mr. *Lampe* (*y*) is favorable to this hiſtorie. And, perhaps, it may be true, abating ſome circumſtances. Which are not ſeldom added to ſuch accounts, to render them the more entertaining.

7. *Jerome* has given an account of St. *John*'s method of preaching, when he was of a great age, and was not able to make a long diſcourſe. This (*z*) was taken notice of by us in a proper place. Nor is the truth of it, though related by *Jerome* only, diſputed, either by (*a*) *Lampe*, or (*b*) *Le Clerc*.

8. It

Ac ſane neſcimus, ſi vera hiſtoria eſt, cur Clemens μύθε, *fabulae*, nomen ipſi primum impoſuerit. Fabula fuit ratione rei ſignificantis, veritaſque reſpectu rei ſignificatae, quae mentibus proponebatur, nempe eximii paſtoris officium, ac vis poenitentiae. Non inſolens erat antiquis, uti apologis ejuſmodi ad informandos mores. . . . Si cui tamen placet de Joanne Clementis narrationem veram hiſtoriam eſſe, quia ſic Veteribus viſum, de hac re quidem contendere nolumus. *Baſn. ann.* 97. *num. x.*

(*y*) *Prolegom. l. i. cap. v. num. iii. . . . ix.*

(*z*) *Vol. x. p.* 103.

(*a*) Licet enim Hieronymus ſolus hujus narrationis auctor ſit, nihil tamen occurrit, quod non cum more Joannis, ut cum ratione Eccleſiae ejus temporis apprime convenit. *Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. v. n. xi.*

(*b*) *H. E. ann.* 99. *num. i.*

8. It is generally ſuppoſed, that *(c) John* is one of thoſe Apoſtles, who lived a ſingle life. It is ſaid by *(d) Tertullian*, and *Jerome*. Which laſt affirms, that *(e)* eccleſiaſtical hiſtorie aſſures us of it. And he makes it the ground of all the peculiar privileges of this Apoſtle.

9. Another thing, ſaid of *John*, is, that he was baniſhed into *Patmos*, an iſland of the Mediterranean Sea, not far from the coaſt of *Aſia*. And, if he is the writer of the book of the Revelation, which we do not now diſpute, the thing is unqueſtioned. But

(c) Vid. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. i. num. xiii.

(d) Joannes Chriſti ſpado. *De Monog. cap.* 17. *p.* 688.

(e) Talem fuiſſe eunuchum, quem Jeſus amavit plurimum, Evangeliſtam Joannem, eccleſiaſticae tradunt hiſtoriae: qui recubuit ſuper pectus Jeſu: qui, Petro tardius ambulante, elatus virginitatis alis cucurrit ad Dominum: qui in ſecreta divinae ſe nativitatis immergens, auſus eſt dicere: In principio erat Verbum. &c. *In If. cap.* LVI. *Tom.* 3. *p.* 410.

Joannes vero noſter, quaſi aquila, ad ſuperna volat, et ad ipſum Patrem pervenit, dicens: In principio erat Verbum, &c. Expoſuit virginitas, quod nuptiae ſcire non poterant. Et ut brevi ſermone multa comprehendam, doceamque, cujus privilegii ſit Joannes, imo in Joanne virginitas: a Domino virgine, mater virgo virgini diſcipulo commendatur. *Adv. Jovin. l. i. T.* 4. *P.* 2. *p.* 169. *Vid. et ad. Princip. virg. ep.* 96. *al.* 16. *ib. p.* 780. *f.*

But I have deferred the conſideration of this particular, till now, becauſe learned moderns are not agreed about the time of it.

V. I ſhall therefore firſt put down the accounts of ancient authors, and then obſerve the opinions of learned men of later times.

The Time, when he was baniſhed to Patmos.

Irenaeus ſays of the Revelation, "that *(f)* it was ſeen no long time ago, but almoſt in our age, at the end of the reign of *Domitian.*" And though *Irenaeus* does not ſay, that St. *John* was then in *Patmos*, yet ſince he ſuppoſeth him to be the perſon, who had the revelation, he muſt have believed him to be then in *Patmos*, as the book itſelf ſays. ch. i. 9.

Clement, of *Alexandria*, in his book, entitled, Who is the rich man that may be ſaved, as cited by *Euſebe*, ſpeaks *(g)* of "*John*'s returning from *Patmos* to *Epheſus*, after the death of the tyrant." By whom, it is probable, he means *Domitian.*

Tertullian,

(f) See cap. 17. *Vol. i. p.* 379.

(g) Επειδὴ γὰρ τὸ τυράννε τελευτήσαντος, ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμε τῆς νήσε μετῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἔφεσον. κ. λ. *Ap. Euſeb. H. E. l.* 3. *c.* 23. *p.* 92.

Tertullian, in his Apologie, ſpeaks of *Domitian*, as *(h)* having baniſhed ſome Chriſtians, and afterwards giving them leave to return home: probably intending St. *John*, and ſome others. In another work he ſays, " that *(i) John* having been ſent for to *Rome*, was caſt into a veſſel of boyling oyl, and then baniſhed into an iſland:" in the time of *Domitian*, as is moſt probable.

Origen, explaining Matt. xx. 23. ſays: " *James (k)* the brother of *John*, was killed " with a ſword by *Herod*. And a Roman " Emperour, as tradition teaches, baniſhed " *John* into the iſland *Patmos* for the teſti- " monie, which he bore to the word of truth. " And *John* himſelf bears witneſſe to his ba- " niſhment, omitting the name of the Em- " perour, by whom he was baniſhed, ſaying " in the Revelation: *I John, who alſo am* " *your brother and companion in tribulation,* " *and in the kingdom and patience of Jeſus* " *Chriſt,*

(h) Tentaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate. Sed qua et homo facile ceptum repreſſit, reſtitutis etiam quos relegaverat. *Apol. cap.* 5.

(i) . . . habes Romam, . . . ubi Apoſtolus Joannes, poſteaquam in oleum igneum demerſus, nihil paſſus eſt, in inſulam relegatur. *De Pr. Haer. cap.* 36. *p.* 245.

(k) Comm. in Matt. T. i. p. 417. *Huet.*

" *Chriſt, was in the iſle of Patmos, for the word* " *of God, and for the teſtimonie of Jeſus* " *Chriſt.* And *(l)* it ſeems, that the Reve- " lation was ſeen in that iſland."

Victorin, Biſhop of *Pettaw* about 290. again and again ſays, that *(m) John* was baniſhed by *Domitian*, and in his reign ſaw the revelation.

Euſebe, giving an account of *Domitian*'s perſecution, ſays: " In *(n)* this perſecution, as it is ſaid, *John*, the Apoſtle and Evangeliſt, being ſtill living, was baniſhed into the iſland *Patmos* for the teſtimonie of the word of God."

Epiphanius, as formerly *(p)* ſhewn, ſays: " *John* propheſied in the iſle of *Patmos*, in the reign of *Claudius*." And in another place, then only referred to, he ſays: " *John* wrote " his Goſpel in his old age, when he was " more than ninety years old, after his re- " turn from *Patmos*, which *(q)* was in the " time of *Claudius Caeſar*."

(l) Καὶ ἔοικε τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τεθεωρηκέναι. *Ibid. C.*

(m) See Vol. v. p. 223.

(n) H. E. l. 3 *cap.* 18.

(p) Vol. viii. p. 311.

(q) . . τὴν ἐπὶ κλαυδίᾳ γενομένην κάισαρος. *Haer.* 51. *num. xii.*

Jerome, in his book of Illuſtrious Men, as *(r)* formerly cited, ſays: "*Domitian* in the fourteenth year of his reign raiſing the ſecond perſecution after *Nero*, *John* was baniſhed into the iſland *Patmos*, where he wrote the Revelation." And in another work, alſo cited *(s)* formerly, he ſays again: "*John* was a Prophet, as he ſaw the Revelation in the iſland *Patmos*, where he was baniſhed by *Domitian*." And I ſhall now tranſcribe below *(t)* in his own words, without tranſlating them, his comment upon Matt. xx. 23. where he ſpeaks of St. *John*'s having been baniſhed into *Patmos*: but does not name the Emperour, by whom he was baniſhed.

Sulpicius Severus ſays, "that *(u)* *John*, the Apoſtle and Evangeliſt, was baniſhed by *Domitian* into the iſland *Patmos*: where he had viſions,

(r) See Vol. x. p. 100. *(s)* P. 102.

(t) Quaeritur, quomodo calicem martyrii filii Zebedaei, Jacobus videlicet et Joannes, biberint: quum ſcriptura narret Jacobum tantum Apoſtolum ab Herode capite truncatum: Joannes autem propria morte vitam finierit. Sed ſi legamus eccleſiaſticas hiſtorias, in quibus fertur, quod et ipſe propter martyrium ſit miſſus in ferventis olei dolium, et inde ad ſuſcipiendam coronam Chriſti athleta proceſſerit, ſtatimque relegatus in Patmon inſulam ſit, videbimus, martyrio animum non defuiſſe, et bibiſſe Joannem calicem confeſſionis. *Comm. in Matt. Tom.* 4. *P. i. p.* 92.

(u) See Vol. xi. p. 11.

viſions, and where he wrote the book of the Revelation."

Arethas, in his Commentarie upon the Revelation, ſuppoſed to be writ in the ſixth centurie, ſays, upon the authority of *Euſebius*, that *(x) John* was baniſhed into *Patmos* by *Domitian*.

Iſidore, of *Seville*, near the end of the ſixth centurie, ſays: "*Domitian (y)* raiſed a perſecution againſt the Chriſtians. In his time the Apoſtle *John* having been baniſhed into the iſland *Patmos* ſaw the Revelation."

We may now make a remark or two.

1. All theſe teſtimonies are of uſe, whether they name the iſland, where *John* was baniſhed, or the Emperour, by whom he was baniſhed, or not. They all agree, that St. *John* was ſent thither by way of puniſhment, or reſtraint, for bearing witneſſe to the truth. Which confutes the opinion of *Lightfoot*, "that *(z) John* travelling in the miniſtrie of "the goſpel, up and down, from *Aſia* weſt-"ward, comes into the iſle *Patmos*, in the

(x) Ἐξόρισον δὲ αὐτὸν γενέσθαι ἐν πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ ὑπὸ δομετιανοῦ, εὐσέβιος ὁ παμφίλε ἐν τῷ χρονικῷ αὐτοῦ βιβλίῳ παρατίθεται. *Andr. in Apoc. ap. Oecum. Tom. 2. p. 654. D.*

(y) *Vol. xi. p. 377.*

(z) *Harmonie of the N. T. Vol. i. p. 341.*

" *Icarian* ſea, an iſland about thirty miles " compaſs. And there on the Lord's-day he " has theſe viſions, and an angel interprets to " him all he ſaw."

2. All theſe writers, who mention the time of the Revelation, and of the baniſhment, ſay, it was in the time of *Domitian*, and that he was the Emperour, by whom St. *John* was baniſhed: except *Epiphanius*, who ſays, it was in the time of *Claudius*. As he is ſingular, it ſhould ſeem, that he cannot be of any great weight againſt ſo many others.

Nevertheleſs, as ſome learned men, particularly *Grotius*, have paid great regard to *Epiphanius* in this point; it is fit, we ſhould conſider, what they ſay.

Says *Grotius* in a tract, entitled A Comment upon divers texts of the New Teſtament, relating to Antichriſt: particularly, upon the tenth verſe of the xvii. chapter of the Revelation: " *John (a)* began to be il- " lumi-

(a) Coepit autem Joannes in Patmo eſſe, et Dei viſis illuminari Claudii temporibus, quae vetuſtiſſimorum Chriſtianorum eſt ſententia, non Domitiani, ut volunt alii. Vide Epiphanium in Haereſi Alogorum. Claudius Judaeos, ſub quorum nomine tunc et Chriſtiani cenſebantur, ut multis viris doctis obſervatum eſt, Roma pepulerat, Act. xviii. 2.

Quod

" luminated with divine viſions in the iſland " *Patmos*, in the time of *Claudius*. Which " was the opinion of the moſt ancient Chriſ- " tians. See *Epiphanius* in the Hereſie of " the *Alogians*. *Claudius*, as we learn from " Acts xviii. 2. *commanded all Jews to depart* " *from Rome*. Under the name of Jews, " Chriſtians alſo were comprehended, as has " been obſerved by many learned men. And " it cannot be doubted, but many Governours " of the Roman provinces followed that ex- " ample. So therefore *John* was driven from " *Epheſus*."

That argument was long ago examined by (b) *David Blondel*, who ſays 1. It is not true, that the moſt ancient writers ſaid, that St. *John* was ſent into *Patmos* by *Claudius*. It is *Epiphanius* only, who ſays ſo. He is altogether ſingular. There are no ancients, either before, or after him, who have ſaid this. 2. As *Epiphanius* is ſingular, he ought not to be regarded. 3. There was no perſecution of

Quod exemplum non dubium eſt, quin imitati ſint multi Praeſides Romanorum provinciarum. Ita Epheſo expulſus Joannes. *Grot. Commentatio ad loca quaedam N. T. quae de Antichriſto agunt, aut agere putantur. Opp. Tom.* 3.

(b) *Des Sibylles. l.* 2. *ch. iii. p.* 145. . . . 148. *à Charenten.* 1649.

the Chriſtians in the reign of *Claudius*. There is no proof from any ancient monuments, that Chriſtians, as ſuch, ſuffered baniſhment under that Emperour. It is allowed, that *(c) Nero* was the firſt Roman Emperour, who perſecuted the Chriſtians. 4. The edict of *Claudius* only baniſhed the Jews from *Rome*. It did not affect the Jews in the provinces, as appears from the New Teſtament itſelf, particularly, Acts xviii. and xix. It is manifeſt from the hiſtorie in the Acts, that in the reign of *Claudius*, in other parts of the Empire, out of *Rome*, the *Jews* enjoyed as full liberty, as they did before. *Paul* and *Silas*, *Aquila* and *Priſcilla*, dwelled quietly at *Corinth*: where the men of their nation had their ſynagogue, and aſſembled in it according to cuſtom, without moleſtation. 5. Nor could the Governours of provinces baniſh either Jews or Chriſ-

(c) Conſulite commentarios veſtros. Illic reperietis, primum Neronem in hanc ſectam, cum maxime Romae orientem, Caeſariano gladio ferociſſe. Sed tali dedicatore damnationis noſtrae etiam gloriamur. *Tertull. Ap. cap. v.*

Nerone imperante. . . . Qui dignus exſtitit, qui perſecutionem in Chriſtianos primus inciperet. *Sulp. Sev. Hiſt. Sacr. l. 2. cap.* 39.

Nam primus Romae Chriſtianos ſuppliciis et mortibus affecit. *P. Oroſ. l. 7. cap. 7.*

Vid. et Euſeb. H. E. l. 2. cap. 25. p. 67.

Chriſtians out of their governments, without order from the Emperour. And that they had no ſuch order, is apparent. Neither Jews nor Chriſtians were moleſted by them at *Epheſus*, as may be perceived from the hiſtorie in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts. That they were not moleſted by them at *Corinth*, appears from the preceding chapter. 6. St. *John* could not be baniſhed from *Epheſus* by *Claudius*, or the Governours under him. For he was not in that city during the reign of that Emperour, nor in the former part of the reign of *Nero*, as has been ſhewn. He did not come thither, till near the end of the reign of the laſt mentioned Emperour. Therefore he could not be ſooner baniſhed from *Epheſus*.

Theſe obſervations, if I am not miſtaken, are ſufficient to confute the opinion of *Grotius*.

Sir *Iſaac Newton* was of opinion, that (B)

(B) Sir *Iſaac Newton*'s opinion is much the ſame with that of *John Hentenius* of *Mechlin*, confuted by *David Blondel* in the ſame work, and in the next chapter to that, in which he confuted *Grotius*. *Hentenius* and *Newton* argue much alike. It may be ſuſpected, that *Newton* incautiouſly borrowed ſome of his weak arguments. Says *Blondel*: " Jean Hentenius en ſa preface ſur le Commentaire d'Arethas. . a le diſcours, qui ſuit :

St. *John* was baniſhed into *Patmos*, and that the Revelation was ſeen in the reign of *Nero*, before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*.

" *Euſebius*, ſays *(d)* he, in his Chronicle, " and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie follows *Irenaeus:* " (who ſaid, the Apocalypſe was writ in the " time of *Domitian:)* But afterwards in his " Evangelical Demonſtration he conjoyns " the baniſhment of *John* into *Patmos*, with " the deaths of *Peter* and *Paul*."

To which I anſwer, *firſt*, that *(e)* the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie was not writ before the Evangelical Demonſtration, but after it. For the Demonſtration is referred to at the end of the ſecond chapter of the firſt book of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie. *Secondly*, *Euſebius* in his

ſuit: *Il me ſemble, que Jean . . . a eſté relegué par Neron en Patmos au meſme temps que celui là a tué dans Rome. . . . Pierre et Paul. Tertullien, voiſin des temps des meſmes Apoſtres, aſſeure cela meſme en deux lieux. Euſebe auſſi traitte la meſme choſe au livre de la Demonſtration Evangelique, combien qu'en ſes Chroniques, et en l'Hiſtoire Eccleſiaſtique il dit que cela eſt arrivé ſous Domitien: ce que auſſi Saint Hierome et pluſieurs autres ſuivent. Mais à ces livres cy, comme eſcris és annees precedentes, ſi grande authorité n'eſt pas attribuée, qu' à celui de la Demonſtration Evangelique, veu qu'il a eſté depuis, et plus correctement élabouré. Blondel des Sibylles. l. 2. ch. iv. p.* 148. 149.

(d) Newton's Obſervations upon the Apocalypſe of St. John. chap. i. p. 236.

(e) See in this work. Vol. viii. p. 47. *Valeſ. Annot. in Euſeb. p.* 8. 9. *Fabric. Bib. Gr. l.* 5. *cap. iv. Tom.* 6. *p.* 57. . . 59.

his Demonſtration is not different from himſelf in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie. In his Demonſtration, having ſpoken of the impriſonment of all the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem*, and of their being beaten, and of the ſtoning of *Stephen*, the beheading of *James* the ſon of *Zebedee*, and the impriſonment of *Peter*, he adds: "*James (f)* the Lord's brother, was ſtoned, *Peter* was crucified at *Rome* with his head downward, and *Paul* was beheaded, and *John* baniſhed into an iſland." But he does not ſay, that all theſe things happened in the time of one and the ſame Emperour. It is plain, that it is not his deſign to mention exactly the time of the ſufferings of all theſe perſons. Nothing hinders our ſuppoſing, that the Apoſtles *Peter* and *Paul* were put to death by order of *Nero*, and *John* baniſhed by *Domitian*, many years afterwards, agreeably to what himſelf writes in his Chronicle and Hiſtorie.

It follows in Sir *Iſaac Newton*. "And "*(g)* ſo do *Tertullian*, and *Pſeudo-Procho-*"*rus*, as well as the firſt author, whoever he "was,

(f) . . . ἡ πέτρος δὲ ἐπὶ ῥώμης κατὰ κεφαλῆς σαυρεῖται παῦλος τε ἀποτέμνεται, ἰωαννης τε νήσῳ παραδίδοται. *Dem. Ev. l.* 3. *p.* 116.

(g) *As before, p.* 236.

" was, of that very ancient fable, that St. " *John* was put by *Nero* into a veſſel of hot " oyl."

I place below *(b)* the words of *Tertullian*, to which Sir *Iſaac* refers. And I anſwer: It is true, that *Tertullian* ſpeaks of the death of *Peter* and *Paul*, and of *John*'s being caſt into boyling oyl, and then baniſhed, all together. But he does not ſay, that all happened in the ſame reign. St. *John*'s baniſhment is the laſt thing mentioned by him. And, probably, it happened not, till after the death of *Peter* and *Paul*. It is likely, that *Tertullian* ſuppoſed it to have been done by the order of *Domitian*. For in another place he ſpeaks of the perſecution of that Emperour, as *(i)* conſiſting chiefly in baniſhments.

" . . . *and Pſeudo-Prochorus*." What place of *Prochorus*, who pretended to be one of the ſeven

(b) Iſta quam felix eccleſia, ubi Petrus paſſioni Dominicae adaequatur: ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur: ubi Apoſtolus Joannes, poſteaquam in oleum igneum demerſus, nihil paſſus eſt, in inſulam relegatur. *De Praeſcr. cap.* 36. *p.* 245.

(i) Tentaverat et Domitianus . . . ſed quâ et homo, facile ceptum repreſſit, reſtitutis etiam quos relegaverat. *Apol. cap.* 5.

ſeven deacons, and is called by *Baronius (k)* himſelf a great lyar, Sir *Iſaac Newton* refers to, I do not know. But in his hiſtorie of St. *John* he is entirely againſt him. For *(l)* he particularly relates the ſufferings, which St. *John* underwent in the ſecond perſecution of the Chriſtians, which was raiſed by *Domitian*. That Emperour ſent orders to the Proconſul at *Epheſus*, to apprehend the Apoſtle. When the Proconſul had got St. *John* in his power, he informed *Domitian* of it. Who then commanded the Proconſul to bring him to *Rome*. When *(m)* he was come, the Emperour would not ſee him, but ordered him to be caſt into a veſſel of ſcalding oyl, and he came out unhurt. Then *Domitian* commanded the Proconſul to have St. *John* back again to *Epheſus*. Some time *(n)* after that, by

(k) — in multis mendaciſſimns hic auctor fuiſſe convincitur. *An.* 92. *num. i.*

(l) Secundam vero perſecutionem Domitianus excitârat, cujus temporibus Joannes Epheſi morabatur. Imperator autem Domitianus epiſtolam miſit Epheſum ad Proconſulem civitatis. . . Proch. de Vit. Joan. cap. 8. Ap. Bib. *Patr. Lugd. T.* 2.

(m) Audiens autem Domitianus de adventu ejus, noluit impius Caeſar videre faciem Apoſtoli. Et juſſit, ut Proconſul duceret ad Portam Latinam, et in ferventis olei dolium illum vivum dimitti. &c. *Ib. cap.* 10.

(n) Ibid. cap. 14.

by order of the ſame *Domitian*, *John*, and others at *Epheſus*, were baniſhed into *Patmos*. *Domitian (o)* being dead, they returned to *Epheſus* with the leave of his ſucceſſor, who did not perſecute the Chriſtians. So *Pſeudo-Prochorus*.

Since the great *Newton* has been pleaſed to refer to ſuch a writer, I ſhall take notice of another, of the like ſort. I mean *Abdias*, who aſſumed the character of the firſt biſhop of *Babylon*. What he ſays, is to this purpoſe: that *(p) John*, who ſurvived the other Apoſtles,

(o) Mortuo autem Domitiano, qui nos tranſmiſerat, in exilium, ſucceſſor ejus non prohibebat Chriſtianos. Et cum audiſſet de bonitate et ſanctimonia Joannis, quodque fuiſſet injuſte a praedeceſſore ſuo exilio relegatus, per literas nos revocavit ab exilio. *Ib. cap.* 45.

(p) Eſt igitur et hoc ipſum amoris Salvatoris in beatum Joannem indicium non vulgare, quod vitâ reliquos omnes ſuperaverit, et, ut dictum eſt, ad Domitiani Imperatoris aetatem uſque in Aſia verbum ſalutis populis adnunciarit.... Cui Proconſul loci cum edictum Imperatoris, ut Chriſtum negaret, et a praedicatione ceſſaret, legiſſet, Apoſtolus intrepide reſpondit... Ad cujus reſponſionem motus Proconſul juſſit eum velut rebellem in dolio ferventis olei demergi. Qui ſtatim ut conjectus in aeneo eſt, veluti athleta unctus, non aduſtus, de vaſe exiit. Ad quod miraculum Proconſul ſtupefactus, voluit eum libertati ſuae reddere. Et feciſſet, niſi timuiſſet edictum Caeſaris. Mitiorem igitur poenam cogitans, in exilium eum relegavit, in inſulam, quae dicitur

tles, lived to the time of *Domitian*, preaching the word to the people in *Asia*. When *Domitian*'s edict for persecuting the Christians was brought to *Ephesus*, and *John* refused to deny Christ, or to give over preaching, the Proconsul ordered, that he should be drowned in a vessel of boyling oyl. But *John* presently leaped out unhurt. The Proconsul would then have set him at liberty, if he had not feared to transgress the Emperour's edict. He therefore banished *John* into *Patmos*, where he saw and wrote the Revelation. After the death of *Domitian*, his edicts having been abrogated by the Senate, they who had been banished, returned to their homes. And *John* came to *Ephesus*, where he had a dwelling, and many friends.

Then follows an account of St. *John*'s visiting the churches in the neighborhood of *Ephesus*. Where is inserted also the storie, formerly taken notice of, concerning the young man,

citur Patmos. In qua et Apocalypsin, quae ex nomine ejus legitur, et vidit, et scripsit. Post mortem autem Domitiani, quia omnia ejus decreta Senatus infringi jusserat, inter ceteros, qui ab eo relegati fuerant, et ad propria remeabant, etiam sanctus Joannes Ephesum rediit, ubi et hospitiolum, et multos amicos habebat. *Abd. Hist. Apostol. cap. v. ap. Fabr. Cod. Apocr. N. T. p.* 533.... 536.

man, as related by *Euſebius* from *Clement* of *Alexandria*: and as happening, not after the death of *Nero*, but of *Domitian*.

Newton proceeds: "as well as the firſt "author, whoever he was, of that very an- "cient fable, that *John* was put by *Nero* into "a veſſel of hot oyl, and coming out unhurt, "was baniſhed by him into *Patmos*. Though "this ſtory be no more than a fiction, yet "it was founded on a tradition of the firſt "churches, that *John* was baniſhed into *Pat-* "*mos* in the days of *Nero*."

Who was the firſt author of that fable, I do not know. But it does not appear, that *Tertullian*, the firſt writer who has mentioned it, thought it to be in the time of *Nero*. He might mean, and probably did mean, *Domitian*, the ſame, who baniſhed *John* into an iſland. As did alſo, the two writers juſt taken notice of, *Prochorus* and *Abdias*, to whom we were led by Sir *Iſaac*. *Jerome*, who *(q)* in his books againſt *Jovinian*, mentions this ſtorie, as from *Tertullian*, according to

(q) Vidit enim in Patmos inſula, in qua fuerat a Domitiano principe relegatus, Apocalypſin. . . . Refert autem Tertullianus, quod Romae, [al. a Nerone] miſſus in ferventis olei dolium purior et vegetior exierit, quam intravit. *Adv. Jovin. l.* 1. *Tom.* 4. *p.* 169.

to ſome copies, ſays, it was done at *Rome*, according to others, in the time of *Nero*. However in the ſame place, as well as elſewhere, *Jerome* expreſſly ſays, that *John* was baniſhed into *Patmos* by *Domitian*. And *(r)* in the other place, where he mentions the caſting St. *John* into boyling oyl, he ſays: "And preſently afterwards he was baniſhed into the iſland *Patmos*." Therefore that other trial, which St. *John* met with, was in the ſame reign, that is, *Domitian*'s. And indeed *Jerome* always ſuppoſes St. *John*'s baniſhment to have been in that reign: as he particularly relates in the ninth chapter of his book of Illuſtrious Men. Let me add, that if the ſtorie of St. *John*'s being put into a veſſel of ſcalding oyl be a fable, and a fiction, it muſt be hazardous to build an argument upon it.

It follows in *Newton*: "*Epiphanius* repre-
"ſents the Goſpel of *John* as written in the
"time of *Domitian*, and the Apocalypſe even
"before that of *Nero*." I have already ſaid enough of *Epiphanius* in conſidering the opinion

(r) Sed ſi legamus eccleſiaſticas hiſtorias, in quibus fertur, quod et ipſe propter martyrium ſit miſſus in ferventis olei dolium, et inde ad ſuſcipiendam coronam Chriſti athleta proceſſerit, ſtatimque relegatus in Patmos inſulam ſit, &c. *Comm. in Matt. xx. 23. Tom. 4. P. i. p. 92.*

nion of *Grotius*. However, as one would think, Sir *Iſaac Newton* had little reaſon to mention *Epiphanius*, when he does not follow him. He ſays, that St. *John* was baniſhed into *Patmos* in the time of *Claudius*: Sir *Iſaac*, not till near the end of the reign of *Nero*.

" *Arethas*, ſays *(s)* Sir *Iſaac*, in the be-
" gining of his Commentarie quotes the
" opinion of *Irenaeus* from *Euſebius*, but
" does not follow it. For he afterwards af-
" firms, that the Apocalypſe was written be-
" fore the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and that
" former Commentators had expounded the
" ſixth ſeal of that deſtruction."

To which I anſwer. *Arethas* does indeed ſay, that *(t)* ſome interpreters had explained things under the ſixth ſeal, as relating to the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* by *Veſpaſian*. But they were ſome only, not the moſt. Yea, he preſently afterwards ſays, that the moſt interpreted it otherwiſe. Nor does he ſay, that any of thoſe Commentators were of opinion,

(s) *As before. p.* 236.

(t) Τινὲς δὲ ταῦτα εἰς τὴν ὑπὸ οὐεσπασιανοῦ γινομένην πολιορκίαν ἐξέλαβον πάντα τὰ εἰρημένα τροπολογήσαντες. Οἱ δὲ πλεῖσοι τῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν. κ. λ. *Areth. cap.* 18. *p.* 709. *A.*

opinion, that the Apocalypſe was writ before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*. *Aretbas* ſeems to have been of opinion, that things, which had come to paſs long before, might be repreſented in the Revelation. Therefore immediatly before that paſſage, explaining Rev. vi. 12. 13. he ſays: "What (*u*) is the "opening of the ſixth ſeal? It is the croſſe "and death of the Lord, followed by his "reſurrection, deſirable to all faithful and "underſtanding men. *And lo, there was a* "*great earthquake*. Manifeſtly denoting, ſays "he, the ſigns that happened during the "crucifixion, the ſhaking of the earth, the "darkneſſe of the ſun, the turning the moon "into bloud. For when it was full moon, "being the fourteenth day, how was it poſ-"ſible, that the ſun ſhould be eclipſed by "it's interpoſition?"

However, I muſt not conceal what he ſays afterwards, in another chapter of his (*x*) Commentarie. He is explaining Rev. vii. 4. . . . 8. "Theſe, ſays he, who inſtructs the "Evangeliſt, will not partake in the calami-

(*u*) Τίς δὲ ἡ λύσις τῆς ἕκτης σφραγίδος; Ὁ σαυρος τῦ κυρίυ ϗ θάνατος, οἷς ἠκολούθησεν ἡ εὐκταῖα πᾶσι πιστοῖς τε ϗ αἰσθητοῖς ἀνάστασις. κ. λ. *Cap.* 18. *p.* 708. *C. D.*

(*x*) *Cap. xix.* 713. 714.

" ties inflicted by the *Romans*. For the de-
" ſtruction cauſed by the *Romans* had not
" fallen upon the Jews, when the Evange-
" liſt received theſe inſtructions. Nor was
" he at *Jeruſalem*, but in *Jonia*, where is
" *Epheſus*. For he ſtaid at *Jeruſalem* no
" more than fourteen years. . . And after the
" death of our Lord's mother, he left *Judea*,
" and went to *Epheſus*, as *(y)* tradition ſays:
" where alſo, as is ſaid, he had the reve-
" lation of future things." But how can we rely upon a writer of the ſixth centurie for theſe particulars? that *John* did not ſtay at *Jeruſalem* more than *fourteen years*: that he left *Judea* upon the death of our Lord's mother, and then went to *Epheſus*: when we can evidently perceive from the hiſtorie in the Acts, that in the fourteenth year after our Lord's aſcenſion, there were no Chriſtian converts at *Epheſus*? and that the church at *Epheſus* was not founded by St. *Paul*, till ſeveral years afterwards. What avails it, to refer to ſuch paſſages as theſe? Which when looked into, and examined, contain no certain aſſurances of any thing. And Sir *Iſaac*

(y) . . . ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἔφεσον μετασῆναι αὐτὸν λόγος. καθ' ἣν, ὡς εἴρηται. κ. λ. *Ibid. p.* 714. *in.*

Iſaac Newton himſelf ſays: "It *(z)* ſeems "to me, that *Peter* and *John* ſtaid with "their churches in *Judea* and *Syria:* till "the *Romans* made war upon their nation, "that is, till the twelfth year of *Nero.*" or A. D. 66.

We proceed with this great man's arguments, who adds: "With *(a)* the opinion "of the firſt commentators agrees the tra-"dition of the churches of *Syria*, preſerved "to this day in the title of the *Syriac* ver-"ſion of the Apocalypſe, which title is "this: *The Revelation, which was made to* "*John the Evangeliſt by God in the iſland* "*Patmos, into which he was baniſhed by* "*Nero Caeſar.*" But how comes it to paſs, that the tradition of *the churches of Syria* is alleged here, when the Apocalypſe was not generally received by them? Moreover in the titles of the books of the New Teſtament received by them, there are manifeſt errours. Nor *(b)* can we ſay, when the *Syriac* verſion of the Apocalypſe was made.

(z) As before, p. 243.

(a) P. 236. 237.

(b) Ad Neronis imperium hoc exilium Syrus refert. Verum incerta eſt quam maxime hujus verſionis aetas, nulloque gaudet ſocio. *Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap.* 4. §. *vii.*

Quapropter

Nor *(c)* is it impoſſible, that the authors of that title might mean *Domitian* by *Nero*. It is not a greater errour, than that of ſuppoſing the epiſtle of *James* to have been writ by *James* the ſon of *Zebedee*.

Again, ſays the celebrated *Newton*: "The "*(d)* ſame is confirmed by a ſtory told by "*Euſebius* out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and "other ancient authors, concerning a youth, "whom St. *John* ſome time after his return "from *Patmos* committed to the care of the "Biſhop of a certain city. This is a ſtory "of many years, and requires, that *John* "ſhould have returned from *Patmos* rather "at the death of *Nero*, than at that of *Do*-"*mitian*."

But

Quapropter nihil in hiſce eſt, quod Syrum ab erroris culpa liberare poſſit: quemadmodum nec ſupra erat, quod Epiphanium in nomine Claudii tueretur. Illud tantummodo adnotatum volo, Syriacam Apocalypſeos verſionem haud aequalem ceterorum librorum interpretationi videri, uti nec primi codices in Europam adlati appoſitam habuerunt, quam demum Ludovicus de Dieu MDCXXVII. in lucem primum produxit. &c. *Ch. Cellarius de ſeptem eccleſiis Aſiae num. xvii. p.* 428.

(c) Sed forſan aliquis, honoris interpretis Syri ſolicitus et cupidus, poſſet in illius gratiam afferere, illum non Neronem, ſed Domitianum, alterum Neronem, ſeu portionem Neronis, ut vocatur Tertulliano. &c. *Le Moyne. Var. Sacr. Tom.* 2. *p.* 1019.

(d) As above. p. 237.

But, *firſt*, if this be only a feigned ſtorie, or apologue, as ſome have thought, contrived to convey moral inſtruction; circumſtances ought not to be ſtrained, nor the truth of hiſtorie be founded upon it. *Secondly*, we muſt take the ſtorie, as it is related by *Clement*, and other ancient authors. *Clement* placeth it after the death of the tyrant, by whom *John* had been baniſhed. And *Euſebe (e)* ſuppoſeth him to mean *Domitian*. *Thirdly*, if St. *John* lived in *Aſia* two, or three, or four years, after his return from *Patmos*, that is time enough for the events of this ſtorie.

Sir *Iſaac* adds in the ſame place: "And "*John* in his old age was ſo infirm, as to "be carried to church, dying above ninety "years old: and therefore could not be "then ſuppoſed able to ride after the thief."

Nevertheleſs in the original account, which we have of this affair, St. *John* is expreſsly called *(f)* an old man. Sir *Iſaac* therefore has no right to make him young. For that

(e) H. E. l. 3. cap. 23.

(f) . . . ἐπιλαθόμενος τῆς ἡλικίας αὐτὸς . . . τί με φεύγεις . . τὸν γυμνὸν, τὸν γέροντα; προσελθόντα δὲ τὸν γέροντα περιέλαβεν. κ. λ. *Clem. ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. c. 23. p. 93.*

would be making a new ſtorie. If a man allows himſelf ſo to do, and argues upon it; the neceſſarie conſequence is, that he deceives himſelf, and others.

Upon the whole, I ſee not much weight in any of theſe arguments of Sir *Iſaac Newton*. And muſt adhere to the common opinion, that St. *John* was baniſhed into *Patmos*, in the reign of *Domitian*, and by virtue of his edicts for perſecuting the Chriſtians, in the later part of his reign. Says Mr. *Lampe*: " All *(g)* Antiquity is agreed, that St. *John*'s baniſhment was by order of *Domitian*."

How long he was there.

VI. We ſhould now inquire, when St. *John* was releaſed, or how long his baniſhment laſted.

According to *Tertullian*, *Domitian*'s perſecution *(h)* was very ſhort, and the Emperour himſelf, before he died, recalled thoſe, whom he had baniſhed. *Hegeſippus* likewiſe

(g) Tota antiquitas in eo abunde conſentit, quod Domitianus exilii Joannis auctor fuerit. *Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. 4. §. viii.*

(h) .. ceptum repreſſit, reſtitutis etiam quos relegaverat. *Apol. cap. v. vid. Supr. p. 355. note (h).*

wiſe ſays, that *(i) Domitian* by an edict put an end to the perſecution, which he had ordered.

Euſebe ſays, " that *(k)* after the death of *Domitian*, *John* returned from his baniſhment." And before, in another chapter of the ſame book, he ſaid more largely: " After *(l) Domitian* had reigned fifteen years, " *Nerva* ſucceded him, and the Roman " Senate decreed, that the honorable titles " beſtowed upon *Domitian* ſhould be abro- " gated, and moreover, that they who had " been baniſhed by him might return to " their homes, and repoſſeſs their goods, of " which they had been unjuſtly deprived. " This we learn from ſuch as have writ " the hiſtorie of thoſe times. Then there- " fore, as our anceſtors ſay, the Apoſtle *John* " returned from his baniſhment, and again " took up his abode at *Epheſus*."

(i) . . . καταπαῦσαι δὲ διὰ προστάγματος τὸν κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διωγμόν. *Ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 20. p. 90. B.*

(k) . ἀπο τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον μετὰ τὴν δομετιανὲ τελευτὴν ἐπανελθὼν φυγῆς. *Euſ. H. E. l. 3. cap. 23. in.*

(l) H. E. l. 3. cap. 20. p. 90. B. C.

Jerome, in his book of Illuſtrious Men, ſays: "When *(m) Domitian* had been killed, and his edicts had been repealed, by the Senate, becauſe of their exceſſive cruelty, *John* returned to *Epheſus* in the time of the Emperour *Nerva*."

I place below a paſſage of *(n)* the Martyrdom of *Timothie* in *Photius*, and another *(o)* of *Suidas*, ſaying, that after *Domitian*'s death, when *Nerva* was Emperour, St. *John* returned from his baniſhment.

This is alſo agreeable to the general accounts in *(p) Dion Caſſius*, and *(q)* the Author of the Deaths of Perſecutors.

Indeed, *Hegeſippus* and *Tertullian*, as before obſerved, intimate, that the perſecution of *Domitian* ended before his death. But it is very remarkable, that *Euſebius (r)* having quoted both of them, gives a different account,

(m) See Vol. x. p. 100.

(n) Νέρβα δὲ τῦ ῥωμαϊκῦ κράτος τὸ σκῆπτρον ἀναδεδεγμένου, ὁ θεόλογος ἰωάννης τῆς ὑπεροχίε φυγῆς ἀφεθεὶς κατάγεται πρὸς ἔφεσον, ἣς καὶ πρότερον ἀπὸ δομετιανῦ πεφυγάδευτο. *Ap. Phot. Cod.* 254. *p.* 1404.

(o) Vid. Suid. voce Νέρβας.

(p) Καὶ ὁ νερούας τύς τε κρινομένυς ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ ἀφῆκε, καὶ φὺς φεύγοντας κατήγαγε. κ. λ. *Dio. l.* 62. *in. p.* 769.

(q) De M. P. cap. 3.

(r) H. E. l. 3. *cap.* 20.

count, as we ſaw juſt now. And, as learned men have obſerved, it is a great prejudice to their authority in this point, that *Euſebius* does not follow them, but preſently afterwards differs from them.

It ſeems probable therefore, that St. *John* and other exils, did not return from their baniſhment, untill after the death of *Domitian*. Which *(s)* is the opinion of *Baſnage*, and likewiſe of *(t) Cellarius*.

Domitian (u) is computed to have died Sept. 18. A. D. 96. after having reigned fifteen years, and ſome days. *Nerva (x)* died the 27, day of Jan. 98. after having reigned one year four months, and nine days. Therefore *Trajan* began his reign Jan. 27. A. D. 98.

If

(s) Utrum Domitianus decretum revocarit, difficilis quaeſtio eſt. Sic enim antiquorum nonnullis viſum. Hegeſippus . . . Hegeſippo aſſentitur et Tertullianus . . . Contra vero nobilis hiſtoricus Dio, qui rerum Romanarum Hegeſippo peritior erat, et Tertulliano, diſertiſſime teſtatur, Nervae indulgentia revocatos fuiſſe Chriſtianos: *Nerva autem eos qui damnati erant impietatis abſolvit, exuleſque reſtituit.* Neque alia mens Lactantio de Mort. Perſ. cap. 3. *Baſnag. ann.* 96. *num. iv.*

(t) Cellar. de Septem. eccleſiis Aſiae. cap. xvii. . . xx.

(u) Baſnag. ann. 96. *n. xiii.*

(x) Baſn. A. D. 98. *i. Pagi ann.* 98. *ii.*

If the perſecution of *Domitian* began in the fourteenth year of his reign, and St. *John* was ſent to *Patmos* that year, and reſtored in the begining of the reign of *Nerva*, his *(y)* exile could not laſt more than two years, perhaps not much above a year.

If St. *John*'s life reached to the third year of the reign of *Trajan*, which is the opinion of *Cave (z)* and many others, he lived three years after his return from *Patmos:* if it reached to the fourth year of *Trajan*, as *(a) Baſnage* thought, he muſt have lived four years after his return.

Or,

(y) In alterum tantum annum ad ſummum duravit, quando Nerva ſuccedens Domitiano exules revocavit, et cum eis Joannem, uti ex vetuſtiorum fide refert Euſebius. l. 3. H. E. cap. 20. . . . Quae quidem eo majorem fidem merentur, quia ipſe Dio, ſeu ex eo Xiphilinus, revocationem exulum Chriſtianorum Nervae tribuit. *Lampe Prol. l. 1. cap. 4. §. ix. Vid. et Cellar. ubi ſupra cap. xviii.*

(z) Interfecto Domitiano Epheſum rediit ann. chr. 97. in qua, ut et in regionibus circumvicinis, reliquum vitae tranſegit, et . . . anno Chr. 100. Trajani 3. juxta Euſebium et Hieronymum, anno uno aut altero centenario major . . . in Domino placide obdormivit. *Cav. H. L. T. i. p.* 16.

(a) Ceterum cum ex antiqua traditione hauſtum videatur, Joannem ſenio confectum, 68. poſt paſſionem anno mortuum eſſe, quae in 33. aerae noſtrae incidit, probabilis eſt conjectura, Joannem anno labente finem hujus lucis inveniſſe. *Baſn. A.* 101. *n. ii.*

Or, in other words: if St. *John* returned about the end of the year 96. or the beginning of 97. and did not die, till the year 101. he lived four years in *Aſia*, after his return from *Patmos*. If he died in the year 100. he lived three years after his return.

Teſtimonies to his Goſpel.

VII. Having now ſaid of St. *John* all that is needful by way of hiſtorie, we come to his writings, of which there are five generally aſcribed to him: a Goſpel, three Epiſtles, and the Revelation: two of which, the Goſpel, and the firſt Epiſtle, are univerſally received as genuine.

Now I ſpeak of the Goſpel only. And here in the firſt place I ſhall recite the accounts of the ancients, but chiefly ſuch, as concern the time when it was writ. Omitting many other teſtimonies, as not neceſſarie to be mentioned now, though very valuable in themſelves. After which we will obſerve the judgements of learned moderns concerning the ſame point: I mean, the time, when it was writ.

Irenaeus having ſpoken of the Goſpels of *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*, adds: "Afterwards *(b)* *John* the diſciple of the Lord, who

(b) See Vol. i. p. 354.

" who alſo leaned upon his breaſt, he like-
" wiſe publiſhed a Goſpel, whilſt he dwelled
" at *Epheſus* in *Aſia*."

In another place he ſays: " *John (c)* the
" diſciple of the Lord declaring this faith,
" and by the publication of the Goſpel de-
" ſigning to root out the errour, which had
" been ſown among men by *Cerinthus*, and
" long before by thoſe who are called *Ni-*
" *colaitans* . . . thus began in the doctrine,
" which is according to the goſpel: *In the*
" *begining was the Word*."

In another place of the ſame ancient writer are theſe expreſſions: " As *(d) John* the
" diſciple of the Lord aſſures us, ſaying:
" *But theſe are written, that ye might believe,*
" *that*

(c) Hanc fidem annuntians Joannes Domini diſcipulus, volens per Evangelii annuntiationem auferre eum, qui a Cerintho inſeminatus erat hominibus errorem, et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitae, qui ſunt vulſio ejus, quae falſo cognominatur ſcientia . . . . Sic inchoavit in ea quae eſt ſecundum evangelium doctrina. *In principio erat verbum. &c. Adv. Haer. l. 3. cap. xi. p.* 188. *Bened.*

(d) . . . quemadmodum Joannes Domini diſcipulus confirmat, dicens: *Haec autem ſcripta ſunt, ut credatis, quoniam Jeſus eſt Filius Dei, et ut credentes vitam aeternam habeatis in nomine ejus:* providens has blaſphemas regulas, quae dividant Dominum, quantum ex ipſis attinet, ex altera et altera ſubſtantia dicentes eum factum. *Adv. Haer. l. 3. cap.* 16. *n.* 5. *p.* 206.

" *that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the ſon of God, and* " *that believing ye might have life through his* " *name.* [ch. xx. 30.] Foreſeeing theſe blaſ- " phemous notions, that divide the Lord, " ſo far as it is in their power."

In the preceding paſſage *Irenaeus* ſpeaks, as if St. *John*'s Goſpel was writ after the riſe of *Cerinthus*, and other hereſies. But here he ſeems to ſay, that it was writ before them, and foreſeeing them. In like manner afterwards, in the ſame chapter, he ſays of *Paul:* " as *(e)* he ſays: *It is Chriſt that died, yea* " *rather that is riſen, who is at the right* " *hand of God.* Rom. viii. 34. And again, " *Knowing that Chriſt being raiſed from the* " *dead, dies no more.* vi. 9. For he alſo " foreſeeing by the Spirit the diviſions of " evil teachers, and being deſirous to cut off " from them all occaſion of diſſenſion, ſays " what has been juſt quoted.

Clement, of *Alexandria*, ſpeaking of the order of the Goſpels, according to what he had

(e) . . . . quemadmodum ipſe ait: *Simul autem Chriſtus mortuus eſt, immo et reſurrexit* . . Et iterum: *Scientes quoniam Chriſtus reſurgens a mortuis, jam non moritur.* Praevidens enim et ipſe per Spiritum ſubdiviſiones malorum magiſtrorum, et omnem ipſorum occaſionem diſſenſionis volens abſcindere, ait quae praedicta ſunt. *Ibid. n.* 9. *p.* 207.

had received from Preſbyters of more ancient times, ſays: "Laſt *(f)* of all *John* obſerving, "that in the other Goſpels thoſe things were "related, which concern the humanity of "Chriſt, and being perſuaded by his friends, "and alſo moved by the ſpirit of God, he "wrote a ſpiritual Goſpel." Here it is ſuppoſed, not only, that St. *John* wrote the laſt of the four, but likewiſe, that he had ſeen the Goſpels of the other three Evangeliſts.

Origen (g) ſpeaks of all the four Goſpels in our preſent order, that is, *Matthew*'s firſt, and *John*'s laſt.

A long paſſage of *Euſebe* concerning St. *John*'s Goſpel may be ſeen vol. viii. p. 90... 96. It cannot be omitted here. But it ſhall be abridged. "And that it has been juſtly "placed by the ancients the fourth in order, "and after the other three, may be made evi-"dent.... For *Matthew* delivered his Goſ-"pel to the *Hebrews*.... And when *Mark* "and *Luke* alſo had publiſhed the Goſpels "according to them, it is ſaid, that *John* "who all this while had preached by word "of mouth, was at length induced to write "for

(f) See Vol. ii. p. 475.
(g) See Vol. iii. p. 235. 236.

" for this reaſon. The three firſt written " Goſpels being now delivered to all men, " and to *John* himſelf, it is ſaid, that he ap- " proved them, and confirmed the truth of " their narration by his own teſtimonie, ſay- " ing: There was only wanting a written ac- " count of the things done by Chriſt, in the " former part, and near the begining of his " preaching... And, certainly, that obſerva- " tion is true...."

Epiphanius (h) ſpeaks of St. *John*'s Goſpel, as the laſt of the four. He alſo ſays, that St. *John* wrote it, after he had long declined ſo doing through humility, when he was ninety years of age, and when he had lived in *Aſia* many years, after his return thither from *Patmos*, in the time of the Emperour *Claudius*. He moreover ſays in ſeveral places, that this Goſpel was occaſioned by the errours of the *Ebionites*, the *Cerinthians*, and other heretics.

According to *(i)* the *Syrian* churches, St. *John* wrote his Goſpel at *Epheſus*.

My readers are again referred to the noble paſſage (*k*) of *Theodore*, Biſhop of *Mopſueſtia*, con-

(h) See Vol. viii. p. 306. 307.
(i) See Vol. ix. p. 217.
(k) Vol. ix. p. 403.... 407.

conceoning the four Goſpels, and to the remarks upon it.

Jerome, in his book of Illuſtrious Men, ſays: " *John (l)* the Apoſtle wrote a Goſpel " at the deſire of the Biſhops of *Aſia*, againſt " *Cerinthus*, and other heretics, and eſpecially " the doctrine of the *Ebionites*, then ſpring- " ing up, who ſay, that Chriſt did not exiſt " before his birth of *Marie*. For which rea- " ſon he was obliged to declare his Divine " nativity. Another reaſon of his writing " is alſo mentioned. Which is, that after " having read the volumes of *Matthew*, " *Mark*, and *Luke*, he expreſſed his approba- " tion of their hiſtorie, as true: but obſerved, " that they had recorded an account of but " one year of our Lord's miniſtrie, even the " laſt, after the impriſonment of *John*, in " which alſo he ſuffered. Omitting there- " fore [very much] that year, the hiſtorie of " which had been writ by the other three, " he related the Acts of the preceding time, " before *John* was ſhut up in priſon. As may " appear to thoſe, who read the four Evan- " geliſts. Which may be of uſe, to account " for the ſeeming difference between *John* " and the reſt."

According

(l) *Vol. x. p. 98.*

According to (*m*) *Auguſtin*, St. *John* is the laſt of the four Evangeliſts.

Chryſoſtom (*n*) aſſigning the reaſons of St. *John*'s writing his Goſpel, ſuppoſeth, that he did not write till after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*.

Paulinus ſays: "it (*o*) had been handed "down by tradition, that *John* ſurvived all "the other Apoſtles, and wrote the laſt of "the four Evangeliſts, and ſo as to confirm "their moſt certain hiſtorie." And he obſerves, "that (*p*) in the begining of St. *John*'s Goſpel all heretics are confuted, particularly, *Arius*, *Sabellius*, *Marcion* and the *Manicheans*.

Coſmas of *Alexandria*, ſays, "that (*q*) when "*John* dwelled at *Epheſus*, there were deli-"vered to him by the faithfull the writings "of the other three Evangeliſts. Receiving "them he ſaid, that what they had writ was "well writ: but ſome things were omitted "by them, which were needfull to be related. "And being deſired by the faithfull, he alſo "publiſhed his writing, as a kind of ſupple-

(*m*) *Vol. x. p.* 228.
(*n*) *Vol. x. p.* 315. 320. 321.
(*o*) *Vol. xi. p.* 43. (*p*) *P.* 44.
(*q*) *Vol. xi. p.* 268. 269.

" ment to the reſt, containing ſuch things as " theſe: the wedding at *Cana*, the hiſtorie of " *Nicodemus*, the woman of *Samaria*, the no- " bleman, [or Courtier, John iv. 46... 54.] " the man blind from his birth, *Lazarus*, the " indignation of *Judas*, at the woman that " anointed the Lord with ointment, the " *Greeks* that came to Jeſus, his waſhing the " diſciples feet, and ſuitable inſtructions upon " ſeveral occaſions, and the promiſe of the " Comforter, and concerning the Deity of " Chriſt, expreſſly, and clearly, at the begin- " ing, and premiſing that, as the foundation " of his work. All which things had been " omitted by the reſt."

Iſidore of *Seville*, ſays, that (*r*) *John* wrote the laſt in *Aſia*.

Theophylact computed, that (*s*) St. *John* wrote about two and thirty years after Chriſt's aſcenſion.

Euthymius, that (*t*) it was not writ, untill many years after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*.

Nicephorus Calliſti ſays, that (*u*) *John* wrote

(*r*) *Vol. xi. p.* 367. (*s*) *P.* 424.
(*t*) *P.* 438. (*u*) *P.* 442.

wrote laſt of all, about ſix and thirty years after the Lord's aſcenſion to heaven.

VIII. Having ſeen theſe teſtimonies of the ancients to St. *John*'s Goſpel, and the time of it, I would now obſerve the judgements of learned moderns.

Judgments of Moderns about the Time of it.

According to *(x) Mill*'s computation St. *John* wrote his Goſpel at *Epheſus*, in the year of Chriſt 97. about one year before his death.

Fabricius (y) ſpeaks to the like purpoſe.

Le Clerc (z) likewiſe placeth the writing of this Goſpel in the year 97.

Mr. *Jones* argues, that (*a*) it was writ about the year 98. and not before 97.

The late Mr. *Wetſtein* thought, that (*b*) this

(z) Et quidem Epheſum ab exilio reverſus Joannes uno ante mortem anno ſcripſit Evangelium. *Mill. Prol. num.* 181.

(y) Evangelium Graece edidit Epheſi, omnium poſtremus, jam nonagenario major, cum e Patmo reverſus eſſet poſt Domitiani necem, quae anno 96. contigit. *Bib. Gr. l.* 4. *cap. v. T.* 3. *p.* 139.

(z) *Hiſt. E. An.* 97. *num. i.*

(a) *New and Full Method, Vol.* 3. *p.* 139.

(b) Hinc etiam conſequitur, Evangelium Joannis non ab eo decrepito, et fere centenario, et poſt mortem Clementis, ſed diu antea fuiſſe editum, adeoque inſcriptionem Codicum Graecorum, qui illud Evangelium anno triceſimo ſecundo poſt aſcenſionem Chriſti, ſcriptum fuiſſe teſtantur, ad verum proprius accedere : praecipue cum ratio nulla ſit, cur Joannes ſcriptionem in tam longum tempus differre debuerit. *Wetſt. Proleg. ad duas Clement. Ep. ſub fin.*

Goſpel might be writ about the year 32. after our Lord's aſcenſion: and diſlikes the ſuppoſition, that it was writ by St. *John* in decrepit old age.

Baſnage (c) was inclined to think, that this Goſpel was writ before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem.* His reaſons will be alleged, and conſidered by and by.

Mr. *Lampe* was of opinion, that *(d)* this Goſpel was writ in the later part of the reign of *Nero*, before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem.*

That it was writ before the Deſtruction of Jeruſalem.

IX. I ſhall now propoſe an argument concerning the date of this Goſpel.

There are two conſiderations, principally, which lead me to think, that St. *John*'s Goſpel was writ before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, or about the time of that event. Theſe I ſhall firſt mention, and then take notice of divers others, obſervable in learned moderns.

1. It is likely, that St. *John* wrote in a ſhort time after the other Evangeliſts. Their Goſpels

(c) *Ann.* 97. *num. xii.*

(d) Putem ergo non contemnandas eſſe rationes, quae ante excidium Hieroſolymitanum Evangelium noſtrum ſub extremis forte Neronis temporibus conſcriptum eſſe perſuadent. *Proleg. l. 2. cap. 2. num. ix.*

pels were ſoon brought to him. And if he thought fit to confirm them, or to write any thing by way of ſupplement, he would do it in a ſhort time. The firſt three Goſpels, very probably, were writ and publiſhed before the end of the year 64. or in 65. at the fartheſt. If they were brought to St. *John* in 65. or 66. he would not defer more, or not much more, than a year, or two, to publiſh his hiſtorie of Jeſus, and make the account compleat.

I do not preſume to ſay exactly the year, in which this Goſpel was writ. But I think, it might be writ, and publiſhed, in the year 68.

This argument offered itſelf to Mr. *Whiſton*'s thoughts, and is thus expreſſed by him: "That *(e)* occaſion of *John*'s writing his "Goſpel, mentioned by the ancients, viz. the "bringing the other three Goſpels to him, "and his obſerving their deficience, as to the "acts of Chriſt before the Baptiſt's impriſon-"ment, does much better agree with this "time, juſt after the publication of thoſe "Goſpels, than with that above thirty years

(e) Eſſay on the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. p. 38. 39.

" later, to which it's writing is now ordinarily " aſcribed."

And is it not a ſtrange ſuppoſition, that all the other three Goſpels ſhould have been writ by the year 60. or thereabout, and St. *John*'s not till the year 97. or 98. that is, more than thirty years after the others? When likewiſe he muſt have been of a very great age, and ſcarcely fit for ſuch a work as this.

2. The ſecond conſideration is the ſuitableneſſe of St. *John*'s Goſpel to the circumſtances of things before the overthrow of the Jews, or about that time.

Mr. *Lampe* has obſerved, that *(f)* the great deſign of St. *John* in writing his Goſpel ſeems to have been, to ſhew, how inexcuſable the Jews were in not receiving Jeſus as the Chriſt, and to vindicate the Providence of God in the calamities already befallen, or now coming

(f) Totam porro oeconomiam hujus Evangelii ita eſſe digeſtam, ut ad convincendos ac ἀναπολογήτους reddendos Judaeos ſpectaret, capite ſequenti oſtendemus. *Prolegom. in Joan. l. 2. cap. 3. §. ii.*

Imminens etiam Judaeae pernicies occaſionem maxime opportunam conſcribendo libro dabat, in quo Joannis animus erat hujus ipſius judicii imminentis aequitatem defendere, et tentare, an Judaei ex hoc Reipublicae naufragio magno agmine in Aſiam enatantes, ad recipiendum unicum mundi Salvatorem hoc medio permoveri poſſint. *Ibid. l. 2. cap. 2. §. xv. Vid. et l. 2. cap. 3. num. iii. not. (b).*

ing upon them. If that appear to be the deſign of St. *John* in writing his Goſpel, it will very much ſtrengthen the ſuppoſition, that it was writ, before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* was compleated.

St. *John* ſays ch. xx. 31. *Theſe things are written, that ye might believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.* That is, "This hiſtorie has been writ, that they who "believe, may be confirmed in their faith, "and that all others, who yet believe not, "may believe in Jeſus, as the Chriſt, the Son "of God, and obtain that life, which he pro-"miſeth to thoſe, who believe in him, and "obey him."

That is the deſign of all the Evangeliſts. And their hiſtories are a ſufficient ground and reaſon of this belief. But St. *John*'s Goſpel contains an ample confirmation of all that they have ſaid, with valuable additions, and more plain and frequent aſſurances, that Jeſus is not only a Prophet, and meſſenger of God, but the Chriſt, the Son of God, or that great Prophet, that ſhould come into the world: whereby all are rendred inexcuſable in rejecting him, and eſpecially the Jews, among whom he preached, and wrought

many miracles, and whom he often called to receive him, as the Chriſt. This *(g)* runs through St. *John*'s Goſpel from the begining to the end, or near the end, of the twelfth chapter.

Even in the introduction he ſays. ch. i. 7. *John came for a witneſſe, to bear witneſſe of the light, that all men through him might believe.* 8. *He was not that light. But was ſent to bear witneſſe of that light.* 9. *That was the true light, which lighteth every man, that cometh into the world.* " That is, he was deſigned " to be an univerſal bleſſing: And he has " done all that was fit to be done, to enlighten " all

(g) Priora duodecim capita evidentiſſime ea commemorant, quae ſeverum et tremendum illud Dei in Judaeos judicium defendunt. Talia enim facta et dicta continuo ordine proponunt, quae non in obſcuro angulo, ſed coram tota gente Judaica edita ſunt, nullamque exceptionem patiuntur. . . . Atque haec eſt ratio, cur Joannes ſecundum feſta Judaeorum hiſtoriam evangelicam digerat. Inde enim innoteſcit, Ieſum ea diligenter frequentaſſe, atque in iis publice coram toto populo Judaico ſe ſatis ſuperque manifeſtaſſe. Iſtud enim Evangeliſtae noſtro plane privum eſt, ut ea potiſſimum narret, quae a Domino noſtro Hieroſolymis, quin in ipſo templo geſta atque dicta ſunt: paucis tantum interjectis, quae eum etiam Judaeam, Samariam, Galilaeam, radiis gloriae ſuae coeleſtis abunde illuſtraſſe, atque ita nullam partem regionis Judaeorum vacuam reliquiſſe, probant. *Lampe. Ibid. l. 2. cap. 4. num. xxxiii. xxxiv.*

" all men in the knowledge of God, and true " religion." Ver. 14. *And we beheld his glorie*, we his diſciples, and all who impartially attended, *beheld his glorie, the glorie, as of the only begotten of the Father:* that is, the glorie, peculiar to the promiſed Meſſiah. Again, at Ver. 18. he ſtiles him *the only begotten ſon.* Here St. *John* may be ſuppoſed to declare his preſent faith, or to make a profeſſion of the faith, which he had at the time of his writing. Having ſo done, he proceeds in the hiſtorie. Ver. 19. 20. *And this is the record of John, when the Jews ſent Prieſts and Levites from Jeruſalem, to ask him, Who art thou.* He anſwered, that he was not the Chriſt, but his harbinger, or fore-runner, the perſon ſpoken of by *Iſaiah.* And he declares the tranſcendent greatneſſe of him, who was about to appear, and was already among them. Ver. 21.... 28. Then at ver. 29. *The next day John ſeeth Jeſus coming unto him, and ſaith: Behold the lamb of God, that taketh away the ſin of the world.* Undoubtedly, by that character meaning the Meſſiah, and underſtood by all, ſo to mean. See alſo ver. 30. 31. 32. 33. Then at ver. 34. *And I ſaw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God:* or the Chriſt. And ver. 35. 36. *Again,*

gain, the next day after John ſtood, and two of his diſciples. And looking upon Jeſus, as he walked, he ſaith: Behold the lamb of God. He tells every body, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, though not always in the ſame terms. And, to finiſh our account of *John* the Baptiſt. In ch. iii. 25... 36. is the laſt teſtimonie, bore by him to Jeſus. And it is very ſtrong, and full. He declares, he was not himſelf the Chriſt, *but was ſent before him. To him*, ſays he, *God giveth not the Spirit by meaſure. The Father loveth the Son, and hath put all things into his hands... He that believeth on the Son, hath everlaſting life. And he that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee life. But the wrath of God abideth on him.*

Having gone through the Baptiſt's teſtimonie, as here recorded, we look back to ch. i. 4... 42. where *Andrew* finds his brother *Simon*, and ſays to him: *We have found the Meſſiah.* Then ver. 45... 51. *Philip findeth Nathanael, and ſaith to him: We have found him, of whom Moſes in the Law, and the Prophets did write, Jeſus of Nazareth. Nathanael* likewiſe is convinced, and ſays: *Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God. Thou art the King of Iſrael.* So writes St. *John*, ſhewing, that the pious, and well diſpoſed among the

the Jews, readily received Jeſus as the Chriſt. And thereby ſhewing likewiſe the great unreaſonableneſſe, and extreme perverſneſſe of thoſe who did not believe in him after all the proofs, which he ſet before them in the courſe of his moſt powerful miniſtrie. As the Evangeliſt moſt juſtly ſays, near the concluſion of this part of his Goſpel. Ch. xii. 37. *But though he had done ſo many miracles among them, yet they believed not on him.* And ſee what follows there.

Ch. ii. 11. After the account of the miracle at *Cana*. *This begining of miracles did Jeſus in Cana of Galilee, and manifeſted forth his glorie:* that is, the glorie of the Meſſiah. *And his diſciples believed on him:* or were confirmed in their belief, that he was the Chriſt.

Soon after this Jeſus went up to *Jeruſalem*, at a Paſſover, and cleanſed the temple, ſaying: *Make not my Father's houſe an houſe of merchandiſe.* ch. ii. 13. . . 17. By the work itſelf, and by his words, manifeſting himſelf to be the Meſſiah. I omit other things in the remaining part of that chapter, which an attentive reader will take notice of.

Then,

Then, ch. iii. 1...21. is the hiſtorie of *Nicodemus*, who, whilſt Jeſus was this time at *Jeruſalem*, made him a private viſit. He immediatly profeſſeth faith in him, as a Prophet. But our Lord tells him plainly, that he was the Meſſiah, and demands a ſuitable regard from him. He likewiſe ſets before *Nicodemus* the nature of his deſign, for preventing, or for removing all worldly expectations from him. He likewiſe intimates the call of the Gentils, and the judgements coming upon the Jewiſh People, if they ſhould perſiſt in unbelief. *For*, ſays he, *as Moſes lift up the ſerpent in the wilderneſſe, ſo muſt the Son of man be lifted up: that whoſoever believeth in him might not periſh, but have everlaſting life.... For God ſent not his Son*, the Meſſiah, *into the world, to condemn the world: but that through him the world*, Gentils as well as Jews, *might be ſaved*. And what there follows.

Jeſus going through *Samaria* from *Jeruſalem*, in his way to *Galilee*, meets with a woman of that countrey. Ch. iv. 19. *The woman ſaith unto him: Sir, I perceive, that thou art a Prophet....* And ver. 25. 26. *The woman ſaith unto him: I know, that the Meſſiah cometh*, or is ſoon to appear.... *Jeſus ſaith*

ſaith unto her: I that ſpeak unto thee am he... The woman left him, and went into the city, *and ſaith unto the men: Come, ſee a man that has told me all things that ever I did. Is not this the Chriſt?* Afterwards, ver. 42. *Many of that place ſaid unto the woman: Now we believe, not becauſe of thy ſaying. For we have ſeen him ourſelves, and know, that this is indeed the Chriſt, the Saviour of the world.* Here is another inſtance of our Lord's freely declaring himſelf to be the Chriſt, and of his accepting a profeſſion of faith in himſelf, as ſuch. And the ready faith of theſe *Samaritans* aggravates the continued unbelief of the Jews, on whom more culture had been beſtowed.

Ch. v. 1. *After this there was a feaſt of the Jews. And Jeſus went up to Jeruſalem.* By many this is thought to be Paſſover. By others it is reckoned ſome other feaſt between the laſt mentioned and the next Paſſover of our Lord's miniſtrie. However that may be, at this ſeaſon our Lord healed the lame man at the pool of *Betheſda*, on the Sabbath-day, and bid him carry his bed, and go home. *Therefore did the Jews perſecute Jeſus, and ſought to ſlay him, becauſe he had done theſe things on the Sabbath Day. But Jeſus anſwered*

ed them: My Father worketh hitherto. And I work. ver. 16. 17. The Jews charge him with blaſphemie. Our Lord vindicates himſelf, and claims the character of the Meſſiah in high terms. And aſſures them, *that all judgement had been committed unto the Son,* meaning himſelf, the Meſſiah: *that all men might honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.* ver. 21...23. And, for proof, he refers to their ſcriptures, the teſtimonie of *John,* and the works, which he had wrought among them, in the Father's name. ver. 24. ...47.

Ch. vi. 1...3. We perceive, our Lord to be in *Galilee,* whither he had gone from *Judea.* Then at ver. 4. *And the Paſſover, a feaſt of the Jews, was nigh.* After which follows the miracle of the five loaves and two fiſhes, for feeding five thouſand. *Then, thoſe men, when they had ſeen the miracle, which Jeſus did, ſaid: This is of a truth that Prophet, which ſhould come into the world:* or, the expected Meſſiah. Their notion of the kingdom, belonging to that character, being worldly and carnal, and they looking for worldly advantages, *would have come, and taken him by force, to make him a King.* So that our Lord found it needful to *depart into a moun-*

a mountain himſelf alone. The diſciples in the mean time took ſhipping, and he came to them walking upon the ſea. When they had received him, *immediatly the ſhip was at the land, whither they were going.* ver. 14... 21. The people having been diſappointed, came to him as ſoon as they could at *Capernaum.* Where our Lord takes an opportunity to reprove their carnal temper, and inſtructs them in the deſign of the Meſſiah, and the nature of his kingdom. And ſtill taking upon himſelf that character, and requiring faith in him as ſuch, he ſays: *I am the bread of life... And this is the will of him that ſent me, that every one which ſeeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlaſting life.... I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat this bread, he ſhall live for ever. And the bread that I will give him is my fleſh, which I will give for the life of the world... Many therefore of his diſciples went back, and walked no more with him.* But *Peter*, in the name of the Twelve, and poſſibly, in the name alſo of ſome others, followers of Jeſus, ſaid: *To whom ſhall we go? Thou haſt the words of eternal life. And we believe, and are ſure, that thou art the Chriſt, the Son of the living God.* ver. 22... 69.

Ch.

Ch. vii. 1. 2. *After theſe things Jeſus walked in Galilee. For he would not walk in Judea, becauſe the Jews ſought to kill him. Now the Jews feaſt of Tabernacles was at hand...* 14. *Now about the midſt of the feaſt, Jeſus went up into the temple, and taught.* Ver. 25. 26. *Then ſaid ſome of them of Jeruſalem... Do the rulers know indeed, that this is the very Chriſt?* Ver. 31. *And many of the people believed on him, and ſaid: When Chriſt cometh, will he do more miracles than theſe, which this man has done?* Ver. 37. 38. *In the laſt day, the great day of the feaſt, Jeſus ſtood, and cried: If any man thirſt, let him come to me, and drink...* He ſpeaks of himſelf in the character of the Meſſiah, and calls on all men to come to him, as ſuch, and receive the great bleſſings, which he is able to beſtow. And at ver. 40. 41. *Many of the people therefore, when they heard this ſaying, ſaid: This is the Prophet. Others ſaid: This is the Chriſt.*

Ch. viii. 12... 23. Our Lord is ſtill at *Jeruſalem.* And at ver. 12. *Then ſpake Jeſus unto them, ſaying: I am the light of the world:* claiming the character of the Meſſiah, and declaring alſo the advantages of believing in him, and the ſad conſequence of not receiving

ing him. Ver. 21. *Then ſaid Jeſus again unto them. I go my way, and ye ſhall ſeek me, and ſhall die in your ſins.* Ver. 24. *I ſaid therefore unto you, that ye ſhall die in your ſins. For, if ye believe not, that I am he,* the Meſſiah, *ye ſhall die in your ſins:* that is, ye will bring upon yourſelves heavie judgements and calamities. Ver. 47. *He that is of God, heareth God's words. Ye therefore hear them not, becauſe ye are not of God...* Ver. 56. *your father Abraham rejoyced to ſee my day....* Does not our Lord in all this propoſe himſelf to them, as the Meſſiah, require their faith in him, as ſuch, and plainly intimate the calamities, that would befall them, if they ſhould continue to reject him?

Nor is there any inconſiſtence in what is here obſerved, and the accounts of the other Evangeliſts. After *Peter* had made a profeſſion of his faith, it is ſaid Matt. xvi. 20. *Then charged he his diſciples, that they ſhould tell no man, that he was the Chriſt.* And compare Mark viii. 30. and Luke ix. 21. Nevertheleſs, he was not unwilling to be thought of in that character. When *Simon Peter* had ſaid by way of anſwer to the queſtion that had been put to the diſciples, *thou art the Chriſt, the Son of the living God:* our Lord

was greatly pleaſed, and pronounced him bleſſed upon that account. And he was deſirous, that all ſhould receive him, as the Meſſiah. It was the deſign of his own, and his fore-runner's preaching, as recorded in all the Evangeliſts, the firſt three, as well as St. *John*. They called upon all men *to repent, for the kingdom of heaven*, or of God, by the Meſſiah, *is at hand*. So Mark i. 14. 15. And himſelf ſays: Matt. xii. 28. *If I caſt out demons by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you*. And Luke xvii. 21. *Behold, the kingdom of God is among you*, or in the midſt of you, not within you, as we render it. But he tells them, that the kingdom of the Meſſiah was already begun to be ſet up among them. When our Lord was baptized, *there came a voice from heaven, ſaying: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed*. Or, this is the Meſſiah. As recorded by all the firſt three Evangeliſts. Matt. iii. 17. Mark i. 11. Luke iii. 22. And in them our Lord accepts applications to him, and confeſſions of faith in him, in the character of *the Son of David*, and *the Son of God*, both which are the ſame as the Meſſiah. Of the former there are many inſtances. Of the later I mention one. Matt. xiv. 33. *Then they that were*

were in the ſhip, came, and worſhiped him, ſaying: Thou art the Son of God. And when he entred into *Jeruſalem*, he accepted the acclamations of the multitude, which cried: *Hoſanna to the Son of David: Bleſſed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Bleſſed is the King that cometh in the name of the Lord.* Matth. xxi. 1...16. Mark xi. 1...11. Luke xix. 28...40. He ſometimes laments the ſmall ſucceſſe of his preaching, and that ſo few received him. But acquieſceth in the event. As in Luke vii. 31....35. Matth. xi. 16...26. Luke x. 21...24. And he even expreſſeth a ſurprize, that the Phariſees, and others, did not diſcern the ſigns of the time. Matt. xvi. 1...4. Mark viii. 11...13. Luke xii. 54...57. And every one may eaſily perceive the reaſon, why he did not allow the diſciples, or ſome others, to ſay publicly, that he was the Meſſiah. For conſidering that the Jewiſh People in general, and the diſciples themſelves, expected a worldly kingdom, and worldly advantages from the Meſſiah; there needed ſome diſcretion, leaſt men ſhould have been led to make tumults and diſturbances, which might have been offenſive to the magiſtrate. But when our Lord ſpoke of himſelf, as the Meſſiah, he al-

ways inculcated the true deſign of his coming, and gave aſſurances of ſpiritual and heavenly bleſſings, and ſuch only.

Our Lord ſtill continues at *Jeruſalem.* Ch. ix. 1...41. is the hiſtorie of the man blind from his birth, whom our Lord healed, anointing his eyes with clay, moiſtened with his ſpittle. *And it was the Sabbath-day, when Jeſus made the clay, and opened his eyes.* The man being brought before the Phariſees, and examined by them, ſaid, that he who had opened his eyes was a Prophet. *And they caſt him out. Jeſus heard, that they had caſt him out. And when he had found him, he ſaid unto him: Doeſt thou believe on the Son of God? He anſwered, and ſaid: Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? Jeſus ſaid unto him: Thou haſt both ſeen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. And he ſaid: Lord, I believe, and he worſhiped him.* All this needs no comment. Afterwards at ver. 39...41. are intimations given to the Phariſees of the ſad conſequences of rejecting him. And indeed in this hiſtorie the bad temper of the Jewiſh Rulers is very manifeſt.

Ch. x. Our Lord ſpeaks of himſelf as *the true ſhepherd,* or the Meſſiah. Ver. 11. *I am the good ſhepherd. The good ſhepherd giveth his life*

life for the ſheep. Ver. 16. *And other ſheep I have, which are not of this fold.* Ver. 22... 24. *And it was at Jeruſalem the feaſt of the Dedication. And it was winter. And Jeſus walked in the temple, in Solomon's porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and ſaid unto him: How long doeſt thou make us to doubt! If thou be the Chriſt, tell us plainly. Jeſus anſwered them: I told you, and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father's name bear witneſſe of me.* A very proper anſwer, certainly. And what follows to ver. 38. deſerves to be conſulted.

Ch. x. 39...42. *Therefore they ſought again to take him, but he eſcaped out of their hand. And went away beyond Jordan, unto the place, where John at firſt baptized. And there abode. And many reſorted unto him, and ſaid: John did no miracles. But all things, that John ſpake of this man, were true. And many believed on him there.*

I ſuppoſe this retreat of our Lord to a place *beyond Jordan*, to be the ſame that is mentioned Matt. xix. 1. and Mark x. 1. upon which ſome remarks were made *(h)* many years ago.

(h) See the Vindication of our Saviour's three Miracles of raiſing the dead. Ch. i. p. 18...22. *firſt ed. p.* 32...37. *2d edit.*

What paſſed during that interval in that countrey, is recorded Matt. xix. 1. . . . . to xx. 1. . . . 16. and Mark x. 1. . . 31. Nor was St. *Luke* unacquainted with this retreat. For he has inſerted in his Goſpel at ch. xviii. 15. . . 30. ſome of the ſame diſcourſes, which are in the other two Evangeliſts, whilſt our Lord was there. I ſay, I ſuppoſe, that St. *John* and the other Evangeliſts ſpeak of one and the ſame receſſe. But St. *John* ſeems to mention more particularly the occaſion of it, in the verſes juſt recited.

In this place, and interval, our Lord lived ſomewhat more privatly, than he had done before. He received all who came to him, either for inſtruction, or to be healed by him. But he did not go about the cities and villages of *Judea*, preaching publicly, as he had done for ſome while before.

I always ſuppoſed, that our Lord's living thus, in that place, at no great diſtance from *Jeruſalem*, had in it a kind deſign. He intended thereby to afford to the Jewiſh People, eſpecially, their Prieſts and Rulers at *Jeruſalem*, an opportunity to conſider, and calmly reflect upon all the wonderful things that had happened among them in the ſpace of a few years, the preaching and baptiſm of *John*, and all

all the things ſaid and done by himſelf in the courſe of his miniſtrie, particularly, the miracles which he had wrought among them, the claims, which he had made of being the promiſed Meſſiah, whom all ought to receive, and the intimations that had been given of impending ruin and miſerie.

Here our Lord waited, willing to reſt the proof of his miſſion upon the teſtimonies, that had been given to it. And if the Rulers of the Jewiſh People had now come, and ſolemnly owned him in the character, he bore, and with which God had clothed him, how joyfully would they have been received! But they were not ſo diſpoſed. *Great multitudes* of the people came to him there, and *he healed them.* The *Phariſees alſo came unto him.* But it was *tempting him.* Matth. xix. 1. 2. 3. Mark x. 1. 2.

But beſide what is recorded by the other Evangeliſts, St. *John* aſſures us, that in this interval our Lord came to *Bethanie*, about fifteen furlongs, or two miles, from *Jeruſalem*, and there raiſed *Lazarus* to life. ch. xi. 1. . . . 44. *Then many of the Jews, which came to Marie, and had ſeen the things which Jeſus did, believed on him:* that is, that he was the Chriſt. *But ſome of them went their way to the*

Phariſees, and told them, what things Jeſus had done. ver. 45. 46. *Then gathered they a Council. . . . Then from that day forth, they took counſel together, for to put him to death.* ver. 47. . . 53. This ſhews, that they were inflexible, and not to be gained by any conſiderations.

It follows in ver. 54. *Jeſus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews: but went thence into a countrey near the wilderneſſe, into a city called Ephraim. And there continued with his diſciples.* Which (*) I ſuppoſe, was not far from the place, from which our Lord came laſt. And from this city, called *Ephraim*, our Lord came to *Bethanie* again, by the way of *Jericho*, a ſhort time before the next Paſſover, as related by the other Evangeliſts. We proceed.

Says St. *John* ch. xi. 55. . . 57. *And the Jews Paſſover was now at hand. . . Now both the Chief-Prieſts and the Phariſees had given a commandment, that if any knew where he was, he ſhould ſhew it, that they might take him.* That is a proof of a determined purpoſe to accompliſh their evil deſigns againſt Jeſus.

The

(*) *Vid. Reland. Palaeſt. l. i. cap.* 56. *Tom. i. p.* 377. *et Lenfant ſur S. Jean. ch. xi. ver.* 54.

The whole following xii. chapter of this Goſpel deſerves attentive regard. I muſt tranſcribe a part, though it adds to the length of theſe extracts. *Then Jeſus, ſix days before the Paſſover, came to Bethanie, where Lazarus was, who had been dead, whom he raiſed from the dead.* xii. 1. *Much people of the Jews therefore knew, that he was there. And they came, not for Jeſus ſake only, but that they might ſee Lazarus alſo, whom he had raiſed from the dead. But the Chief-Prieſts conſulted, that they might put Lazarus alſo to death: becauſe that by reaſon of him many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jeſus.* ver. 9...11. And here is an account of ſome *Greeks*, or Gentils, who were *deſirous to ſee Jeſus.* ver. 20....22. Whoſe readineſſe, accompanied with humility, may be reaſonably underſtood to caſt a reflexion upon the pride and obſtinacie of thoſe, who were unmoved by the moſt powerful arguments, and the moſt gracious invitations. The remainder of that chapter, from ver. 35. to 50. is a moſt proper concluſion of this part of the Goſpel, in which are theſe things very obſervable. *Then Jeſus ſaid unto them: Yet a little while the light is with you. Walk while ye have the light, leaſt darkneſſe come upon you. ...While ye have the light, believe in the light, that*

that ye may be the children of light. . . . But though he had done ſo many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: that the ſaying of Eſaias might be fulfilled. . . . Jeſus cried, and ſaid: He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that ſent me. I am come a light into the world, that whoſoever believeth on me, ſhould not abide in darkneſſe. . . I have not ſpoken of my-ſelf. But the Father which ſent me, he gave me a commandment, what I ſhould ſpeak. And I know, that his commandment is life everlaſting. Whatſoever I ſpeak therefore, even as the Father ſaid unto me, ſo I ſpeak.

Then in the xiii. xiv. xv. xvi. and xvii. chapters our Lord inſtructs and comforts, prays with and for his diſciples: ſhewing *(i)* tokens of the tendereſt affection, and the moſt faithful concern for thoſe, who had paid a due regard to the evidences of his miſſion, and adhered to him under difficulties and diſcouragements. So begins the next, that is, the thir-

(i) Sicut vero hactenus ſeveritatem Domini in Judaeos defendit Evangeliſta, ita in ſequentibus a capite xiii. ad finem uſque fidelitatem Chriſti illibatam, quam diſcipulis ſuis addixit, ex ultimis verbis adſerit. Haec intentio haud obſcure addiſcitur ex nova, quae alteri hujus Evangelii parte praefigitur, praefatiuncula. cap. xiii. 1. . . . *Lamp. Prol. l. 2. c. 4. num. xxxvi.*

thirteenth chapter: *Now before the feaſt of the Paſſover, when Jeſus knew, that his hour was come, that he ſhould depart out of the world unto the Father: having loved his own, which were in the world, he loved them unto the end.*

And indeed it was very natural for the Evangeliſt, who had largely ſhewn the unreaſonableneſſe, and the aggravated guilt of the Jews, who did not believe in Jeſus, but rejected him, to give alſo a particular account of our Lord's kind acceptance of thoſe who believed in him, and perſevered in their faith.

So that the deſign of ſhewing, how inexcuſable the Jewiſh People were, in rejecting Jeſus, and of vindicating Divine Providence in the calamities brought upon them, is what produced the whole order and economie of this Goſpel.

The two following chapters, the xviii. and xix. contain the account of our Lord's proſecution, condemnation, death, and interment. In the two laſt chapters the xx. and the xxi. are the accounts of our Lord's reſurrection, and the evidences of it, with many tokens of kind regard for his diſciples, who had followed him in the time of his abode on this earth, and were now to be his witneſſes in the world,

and

and to preach, under many difficulties, the ſame doctrine, which he had taught.

There is another thing, which may induce us to think, that one great deſign of St. *John* in writing his Goſpel was to ſhew the unreaſonableneſſe, and the great guilt of the Jews, in rejecting Jeſus: that in his Goſpel are inſerted more inſtances of their attempts upon our Lord's life, than in the other Goſpels. Some ſuch things there are in them. Accounts of the Phariſees conſulting, how they might deſtroy Jeſus, may be ſeen in Matt. xii. 14. Mark iii. 6. Luke vi. 11. beſide their laſt attempt: when they were permitted to accompliſh their evil deſign. But there are more ſuch inſtances in St. *John*'s, than in any of the other Goſpels. As John vii. 1. *After theſe things Jeſus walked in Galilee. For he would not walk in Judea, becauſe the Jews ſought to kill him.* However, he came up to *Jeruſalem* at the next feaſt of Tabernacles. ver. 2. And their deſigns were renewed. Ch. vii. 25. *Then ſaid ſome of them at Jeruſalem: Is not this he, whom they ſeek to kill?* ... Ver. 31. 32. *And many of the people believed on him, and ſaid: When the Chriſt cometh, will he do more miracles, than theſe, which this man has done? The Phariſees heard, that they murmured ſuch*

ſuch things concerning him. And the Phariſees and Chief-Prieſt ſent officers to take him. But the officers, overcome by the excellence of his diſcourſes, could not perſuade themſelves to apprehend him. For which they were reproached by the Council in a moſt outrageous manner. But *Nicodemus* ſtrove to allay their reſentment. ver. 45. . . 52. And ch. viii. 20. *Theſe words ſpake Jeſus, in the treaſurie, as he taught in the temple. And no man laid hands on him, becauſe his time was not yet come.* . . Ver. 37. *I know, that ye are Abraham's ſeed. But ye ſeek to kill me, a man which has told you the truth, which I have heard of God. This did not Abraham.* Ver 59. *Then took they up ſtones to caſt at him.* . . . . And ch. x. 39. 40. *Therefore they ſought again to take him: but he eſcaped out of their hand. And went away beyond Jordan.* And when our Lord propoſed to go to *Bethanie*, upon occaſion of the ſickneſſe and death of *Lazarus*, the diſciples go unwillingly, and would have diſſuaded him from that journey, being apprehenſive of the imminent danger therein both to him and themſelves. ch. xi. 7. . . . 16. See likewiſe ver. 45. . . 57. All theſe are things quite omitted by the other Evangeliſts. As is alſo what is ſaid. ch. xii.

10.

10. 11. And in their laſt perſecution of Jeſus before *Pilate* there are ſome very aggravating particulars mentioned by St. *John*, which the other Evangeliſts have not taken notice of. See ch. xviii. 29. . . . 32. xix. 1. . . 15.

Our bleſſed Lord, preparing his diſciples for afflictions, reconciling their minds to them, and encouraging them to endure them patiently, ſays, ch. xv. 21. . . . 24. *All theſe things will they do unto you for my name's ſake, becauſe they know not him that ſent me. If I had not come, and ſpoken unto them, they had not had ſin. But now they have no excuſe for their ſin. He that hateth me, hateth my Father alſo. If I had not done among them the works, which no other man did, they had not had ſin. But now have they both ſeen, and hated both me and my Father.* That is a ſtrong, but juſt and true repreſentation of the heinouſneſſe of the guilt of the Jewiſh People. For which reaſon I could not forbear to allege it here, though it ſhould be thought out of place.

And now having, as I ſuppoſe, ſhewn this deſign of the Evangeliſt, let me mention an obſervation, or two, by way of corollarie.

Firſt.

Firſt. We ſee the reaſon of St. *John*'s recording the miracle of raiſing *Lazarus*, omitted by the other Evangeliſts. There was no neceſſity, that they ſhould mention it. For without it they have recorded ſufficient evidences of our Lord's miſſion and character. Nor was it poſſible, without an improper prolixity to record all our Saviour's diſcourſes and miracles, as St. *John* himſelf has obſerved. Moreover the firſt three Evangeliſts have chiefly inſiſted upon the moſt public part of our Lord's miniſtrie. For which reaſon this miracle did not come ſo directly in their way. But St. *John* could not omit it. His deſign neceſſarily led him to relate this great miracle, done ſo near *Jeruſalem*, and with all it's circumſtances. For it manifeſtly ſhews the perverſe and incorrigible temper of the Jewiſh Prieſts and Rulers.

Secondly. None ought any more to make a queſtion, whether our Lord twice cleanſed the temple, or once only. It was cleanſed by him at the time of his laſt Paſſover, as related by the firſt three Evangeliſts. But it was very proper for St. *John* to record that done at the firſt Paſſover of our Lord's miniſtrie: it affording an alarming evidence of his being the expected Meſſiah, which ſhould have

have been taken notice of by the Jewiſh Rulers at *Jeruſalem.* It was an early and open claim of the character of the Meſſiah. And their neglecting that, and ſo many other claims and evidences of the ſame great truth afterwards, manifeſts the obſtinacie of their unbelief. Which was fitly ſhewn by this Evangeliſt.

I now proceed to ſome other arguments.

3. One argument, that St. *John*'s Goſpel was writ before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, is taken from ch. v. 2. *Now there is at Jeruſalem, by the ſheep-market*, or Sheep-Gate, *a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches.*

On this paſſage inſiſt both *(k) Baſnage* and *(l) Lampe.* St *John* does not ſay, as they

(k) Porro quod tam ſero ſcriptum Joannis Evangelium tradamus, id ex ſententia potius veterum, quam ex rei veritate fecimus. Ex ipſo quippe Evangelio naſcitur argumentum ad exiſtimandum, lucem prius aſpexiſſe, quam Hieroſolyma everteretur. *Eſt*, inquit, *Hieroſolymis ad portam ovium piſcina.* Stetiſſe ergo videtur urbs ſancta, Joanne ea verba ſcribente. Secus, non praeſens, *eſt*, ἐστι, ſed praeteritum adhibuiſſet. *Baſn. An.* 97. *n. xii.*

(l) Habetur igitur hic non tantum mentio *portae ovium*, tanquam tunc adhuc exſtantis, cum ſcriberet Evangeliſta, ſed etiam aedificii ex quinque porticibus conſtantis, quales ſtructurae poſt dirutam a Romanis Hieroſolymam illic fruſtra eſſent quaeſitae. Licet enim piſcinam ſupereſſe velint itinera-

ria,

they obſerve, *There was*, but *there is*. And though the pool might remain, it could not be ſaid after the ruin of the city, that the *five porches* ſtill ſubſiſted.

Mr. *Whiſton* argues in this manner. "St. "*John*'s *(m)* ſpeaking of the *Pool of Betheſda* "in the preſent tenſe better agrees to the "time here aſſigned, A. D. 63. before the "deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, when that Pool "and Porch were certainly in being, than to "the time afterwards, when probably both "were deſtroyed."

Dr. *Whitby* likewiſe was ſomewhat affected by this text, and ſays: "If *there is* be the "true reading, as the conſent of almoſt all "the *Greek* copies argues, it ſeems to inti-"mate, that *Jeruſalem* and this Pool were "ſtanding, when St. *John* wrote his Goſpel: "and therefore, that it was written, as *Theo-*"*phylact*, and others ſay, before the deſtruc-"tion of *Jeruſalem*, and not, as the more an-"cient Fathers thought, long after."

ria, portae tamen ac muri ſolo aequata erant. Inde igitur colligimus, ſtetiſſe urbem ſanctam, Joanne ea verba ſcribente. Secus non praeſens *eſt*, ſed praeteritum adhibuiſſet. *Lamp. Prol. l. 2. cap. 2. num. xi.*

(m) Eſſay on the Conſtitutions. ch. i. p. 38.

But Mr. *Jones*, beſide other things, ſays, " that *(n)* in all probability the Pool was not " filled up, but was ſtill in the ſame ſtate, af- " ter the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, as before." To which, however, it might be anſwered, that ſuppoſing the Pool not to have been filled up, it would not be reaſonable to think, that the *porches* and the *gate* ſtill ſubſiſted, after the deſtruction of the city. But then Mr. *Jones* adds: " Suppoſing the Pool was deſ- " troyed, and St. *John* to have known it, there " is no impropriety in uſing the verb *is:* " nothing being more common among wri- " ters, than to uſe verbs in the preſent tenſe, " to denote the preterperfect."

Having repreſented this argument, as it has appeared to divers learned men, I leave every one to judge of it.

4. In ch. xxi. 18. 19. Chriſt foretells, that *Peter* would die by martyrdom. Then it is added: *This ſpake he, ſignifying, by what death he ſhould glorify God.* Some may hence argue, that *(o) Peter* was not yet dead, when this

(n) New and Full Method. vol. 3. p. 141.

(o) Poſt Petri martyrium editum eſſe Joannis Evangelium conſenſus eſt Patrum omnium. Fit tamen in ea re ſcrupulus. Petro Chriſtus mortem diſerte portendit. cap. xxi. 18. ... Quae

this was writ: or that St. *John* did not then know of it. But others may be of opinion, that *(p)* though *Peter* had ſuffered martyrdom a good while before, and St. *John* knew it very well; yet he was not obliged to take notice of it, but might write as he does.

Indeed, I am of opinion, that St. *John* could not take notice of *Peter*'s death. It was not a thing within his province. As an Evangeliſt, he wrote the hiſtorie of our Saviour, not of his Apoſtles.

5. A like argument may be taken from the following verſes. 20. 21. 22. *Peter ſeeing John, ſaith to Jeſus: Lord, and what ſhall this man do? Jeſus ſaith unto him: If I will, that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this ſaying abroad, that this diſciple ſhould not die. Yet Jeſus ſaid not unto him, he ſhall not die: but if I will,*

Quae ſi ſcripta ſunt, jam miſſo ad mortem Petro, injici de ea re mentio debebat, ut et completi oraculi cognitio caperetur, et martyri Chriſti laus ſua concederetur. *Baſnag. Exercit. p.* 384.

(p) Locus ex Joh. xxi. 18. non magni in hac cauſſa momenti eſt. Nullam enim video neceſſitatem, cur mortem Petri commemoraret, ſi vel actu notitiam ejus habuiſſet, quia ſic per ſe ſatis veritas praedictionis Ieſu innotuiſſet. &c. *Lamb. ib. l. 2. c. 2. §. xiii.*

that he tarry, till I come, what is that to thee? If by Chriſt's *coming* be here intended the overthrow of *Jeruſalem*, as many think, it may be ſuppoſed reaſonable by ſome to expect, that St. *John* ſhould have taken ſome notice of it here, if he wrote after that event. Nevertheleſs, I humbly apprehend, that this is not an argument of much weight. I do not think, that as an Evangeliſt he was obliged to give an account of the fulfilment of Chriſt's prediction, though he had been a witneſſe of it.

6. *This is the diſciple, that teſtifieth theſe things, and wrote theſe things. And we know, that his teſtimonie is true.* By theſe laſt words Mr. *Lampe (q)* ſuppoſeth, to be meant ſome Jews, then living in *Aſia*, who were eye-witneſſes of our Lord, and his miniſtrie: which might well be, if St. *John*'s Goſpel was writ before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*: but would not be reckoned likely, if it was writ not before the year of the vulgar epoch 97. or 98. They who confirm the teſtimonie of another, ought to have the ſame certain knowledge of the thing teſtified, as he who ſpeaks, or writes. But after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*,

(q) *Ibid. l. 2. cap. 2. num. ix.*

ruſalem, it is not reaſonable to think, there were many to bear witneſſe to things done forty or fifty years before. Theſe Jews, eye-witneſſes of our Lord, Mr. *Lampe* ſuppoſeth to have been believers of that nation, who accompanied *John* into *Aſia*, when he left *Judea*.

I have thought it proper, not to omit this argument of that learned writer. But it depends upon his interpretation of this verſe. Which is not certain. For ſome have ſuppoſed, that *(r)* it is the church of *Epheſus*, which here ſpeaks. And others think it to be *(s)* St. *John* himſelf. The change of number and perſon, of *we* for *I*, is no valid objection. So 1. John i. 1. . . . . 5. *That which we have heard, which we have ſeen with our eyes. . . .* 3. *ep.* 12. *Yea, and we alſo bear record. And ye know, that our record is true.* And St. *Paul* 1. Theſſ. ii. 18. *Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once*

(r) Et ſcimus.] Loquitur eccleſia Epheſina. *Scimus*, aiunt, *fide dignum*, ex vitae ſcilicet puritate, et miraculis ab eo editis. *Grot. in loc.*

(s) "The Evangeliſt had ſaid before ch. xix. 35. *He knoweth, that he ſays true.* Here in this place he changeth the perſon, ſaying: *We know, that his teſtimonie is true.*" *Lightfoot upon John xxi. 24. vol. 2. p. 627. See likewiſe Whitby, Lenfant, and Doddridge upon the place.*

and again. But Satan hindred us. Chryſoſtom (t) and *Theophylact (u)* underſtood St. *John* to ſpeak here of himſelf, as an eye-witneſſe, who had been preſent at almoſt every thing, related by him in his hiſtorie.

7. It is ſaid: "The three epiſtles of St. "*John* do ever ſuppoſe, the Goſpel of St. "*John* to have been written long before, and "to be well known by thoſe, to whom he "wrote. And they are written with a con-"ſtant view and regard to the contents of the "ſame Goſpel." That is an argument *(x)* of Mr. *Whiſton*, which, with what he adds by way of confirmation, is referred to the reader's conſideration.

8. Some have argued for an early date of this Goſpel, or at leſt, that it was writ before the Revelation, which was ſeen in *Patmos*, becauſe

(t) Καὶ ὅιδά, φησιν, ὅτι ἀληθῆ ἐστιν ἃ λέγει. . . . Καὶ πᾶσι δὲ παρῆν, καὶ ἐδὲ σαυρομένε ἀπολιμπάνετο, καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἀνεχειρίθη. *Chryſ. hom.* 88. *al.* 87. *T.* 8. *p.* 588. *C. D. E.*

(u) Καὶ ὅιδά, φησιν, ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγει, τυτέστι. πληροφορηθεὶς ἔγραψα, ἃ ἔγραψα, ἅτε πᾶσι παρὼν, καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις, καὶ τοῖς λόγοις. καὶ τοῖς πάθεσι, καὶ τοῖς μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. Αγαπητὸς γὰρ ἦμην, καὶ ὐκ ἀπελιμπανόμην, ὥστε παῤῥησιάζομαι, καὶ περὶ ἐμαυτῦ λέγω, ὅτι ἀληθεύω. *Theophyl. in Jo. Tom. i. p.* 847.

(x) See his Commentarie upon St. John's three Catholic Epiſtles, p. 8. *&c.*

becauſe *(y)* it is ſaid at the begining of that book, ch. i. 1. 2. . . *Who bare record of the word of God, and of the teſtimonie of Jeſus Chriſt, and of all things, which he ſaw.* They ſuppoſe, that therein St. *John* refers to his Goſpel, and what he had writ in it. But to me the moſt reaſonable account of thoſe words appears to be that, which *(z)* was given formerly: That they are moſt properly underſtood of that very book, the Revelation, and the things contained in it. The writer there ſays, very pertinently, in his introduction, that in that book he had diſcharged the office, aſſigned him: having therein faithfully recorded the word of God, received from Jeſus Chriſt, and all the viſions, which he had ſeen.

9. Once more, it is argued from inſcriptions, at the end of this Goſpel, in divers manuſcripts, that it was writ before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*: it being there ſaid, that

(y) Ipſum porro audiamus Evangeliſtam idem non obſcure, uti nobis videtur, ſubindicantem, quando Apoc. i. 2. ſe ita circumſcribit: ὃς ἐμαρτύρησε τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ. . . Et verſu 9. . . . Plurimi optimi interpretes in eo conſentiunt, quod in his verbis ad Evangelium reſpiciatur, licet in modo demonſtrandi differant &c. *Lamp. Prol. l. 2. cap. 2. §. viii.*

(z) See Vol. iv. p. 703.

this Goſpel was writ in the time of *Nero*, at thirty years, or about two and thirty years after our Saviour's aſcenſion. Upon theſe inſiſted *(a)* Mr. *Wetſtein* in a paſſage quoted from him ſome while ago. Upon them likewiſe inſiſts *(b)* Mr. *Lampe*.

For my own part, I lay not any ſtreſſe at all upon theſe inſcriptions, at the end of *Greek*, or *Arabic*, or other manuſcripts of the New Teſtament, writ in the ninth, or tenth centurie, or later. They *(c)* are of no authority. For there is no proof, that this account was derived from the teſtimonie, or tradition of ancient authors. The early date of the Goſpels was popular. Some having without

(a) See before p. 387.

(b) Accedit multarum gloſſarum et verſionum in id conſenſus, quod ſub Nerone Evangelium ſit exaratum. Licet enim authoritates hae ſequioris aevi ſint, ob earum tamen frequentiam et harmoniam valde eſt credibile, quod in antiquiori traditione fundatae ſint. . . . Id tamen obſervavi diſcrimen, ut quaedam numero rotundo XXX poſt Chriſti adſcenſionem, aliae XXXII nominent. *Lampe ibid. l.* 2. *cap.* 2. *num. xii. Vid. et num. xiv.*

(c) Neque ordo, qui nunc receptus eſt epiſtolarum, ſequitur ordinem temporis, neque antiqua ſunt illa, quae ſub finem ſunt addita, ad ſignificandum, unde et per quos miſſae ſunt. . . et illae in fine annotatiunculae ſerae ſunt, ex conjectura, aut tenui fama. *Grot. Comm. in loca quaedam N. T. ſub in. Tom.* 3. *p.* 457.

without reaſon determined the time of writing the other Goſpels at eight, or ten, or fifteen years after our Lord's aſcenſion, pitched upon the year 30. or 32. for the time of St. *John*'s Goſpel. But it was done upon no other ground and foundation, but mere fanſie and conjecture.

X. It is upon the two firſt mentioned arguments, that I chiefly relye. However, there are objections, which deſerve to be conſidered. *Objections.*

1. Obj. *Chryſoſtom* was of opinion, that St. *John* did not write, till after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*. For in a homilie upon Matth. xxiv. he ſays: "*John (d)* writes not of any "of theſe things, leaſt it ſhould be thought, "that he took an advantage from the event. "For he was living a good while after the "deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*. But the other "Evangeliſts, who died before the deſtruc-"tion of *Jeruſalem*, and ſaw none of thoſe "things, record theſe predictions."

To which I anſwer, that St. *John*'s omitting our Saviour's predictions concerning the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, which are recorded by the other Evangeliſts, is no proof, that he did

(d) *See Vol. x. p.* 321.

did not write, untill after they were fulfilled. For if he wrote at the time ſuppoſed by us, when that event was near; it is very likely, that he would omit theſe predictions: eſpecially, having obſerved, that they were ſufficiently recorded already. And we plainly ſee, that it is not St. *John*'s method, to repeat what had been recorded before. However, he has inſerted in his Goſpel divers expreſſions, containing warnings and intimations of the miſeries coming upon the Jewiſh People, if they did not receive the Lord Jeſus as the Meſſiah. *John* the Baptiſt may be ſuppoſed to intend this in words, recorded John iii. 36. Our Lord intimates it in his diſcourſe with *Nicodemus*. iii. 18. 19. and upon divers other occaſions, already taken notice of by us, in this Goſpel. ch. viii. 12. 21. 24. ix. 39. . . . 41. xii. 35. 36.

2. Obj. Mr. *Whiſton* in *(e)* his Short View of the Harmonie of the Evangeliſts, ſays, "that St. *John* uſeth the *Roman* or *Julian* begining of the day in his Goſpel, the ſame that we uſe at preſent, and reckons the hours from midnight and noon. He refers to *John* i. 39. xix. 14. and xx. 19. Which he reckons an argument,

(e) P. 115. 116.

argument, that St. *John* wrote his Goſpel long after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and the period of the Jewiſh polity, at *Epheſus*, a place remote from *Judea*, and under the Roman government."

To which I anſwer 1. It does not appear to me, that St. *John* computes the hours of the day after the Roman, but rather after the Jewiſh manner. 2. Suppoſing St. *John* to have uſed the Roman method of computation, it does not follow, that he wrote after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and the period of the Jewiſh polity. We allow, that St. *John*'s Goſpel was writ at *Epheſus*, at a diſtance from *Judea*. And, if he thought fit, he might uſe the Roman way of reckoning, eſpecially, when the period of the Jewiſh commonwealth was near, though not quite accompliſhed.

Thus I have endeavoured to ſolve this objection. What was Mr. *Whiſton*'s own ſolution, I do not know. But I ſuppoſe, that he afterwards overcame this difficulty. For in his later writings he maintains a very different ſentiment concerning the date of St. *John*'s Goſpel, pleading, that it was writ about the year of Chriſt 63. a good while before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*. So he argues in his

his Eſſay upon the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, publiſhed, in 1711. and in his Commentarie upon St. *John*'s Epiſtles, publiſhed in 1719. His Harmonie of the four Evangeliſts was printed at *Cambridge* in the year 1702.

3. Obj. It is farther objected, that many ancient writers ſpeak of a late date of St. *John*'s Goſpel, and that he wrote with a deſign to confute divers heretics: who cannot be ſuppoſed to have appeared, till after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and the overthrow of the Jewiſh People.

To which I anſwer, that this may have been owing to a miſtaken apprehenſion. Many heretics, they ſaw, might be confuted by St. *John*'s Goſpel. Therefore they concluded, that he did not write, till after they had appeared in the world: whilſt the truth might be no more than this, that ſuch and ſuch heretics might be confuted out of his Goſpel: though they had not appeared in the world, till long after. *Paulinus* ſays, "that "(*f*) in the begining of St. *John*'s Goſpel all "heretics are confuted, particularly, *Arius*, "*Sabellius*, *Photinus*, *Marcion*, and the *Ma*-"*nicheans*." And in Mr. *Wetſtein*'s preface to

(*f*) *See Vol. xi. p. 44.*

to St. *John*'s Goſpel, writ not long ago, in our time, are theſe expreſſions. Having before quoted *Irenaeus*, he adds: "Which *(g)* if "they be compared with thoſe things, which "*Carpocrates*, *Menander*, *Cerdo*, *Saturninus*, "*Baſilides*, *Valentin*, and *Marcion*, have ſaid "of angels, and aeons: among whom were "Charis *Grace*, Alethea *Truth*, Monogenes "*Only begotten*, Logos *Word*, Zoe *Life:* it "muſt be manifeſt, that *John* ſo oppoſed his "doctrine to them, as to uſe the forms of ex-"preſſion, received by them." Surely, this is very incautious, and inaccurate. Muſt it not be ſo, to ſay, that St. *John* oppoſed thoſe heretics, moſt of which are heretics of the ſecond centurie? If St. *John*'s goſpel be genuine, it muſt have been writ before the end of the firſt centurie. Yea, Mr. *Wetſtein* ſays, it was writ at about two and thirty years after Chriſt's aſcenſion. How then could St. *John* oppoſe them, or write againſt them, but in the way of prophecie, or prevention? But to ſay,

(g) Quae ſi comparentur cum iis, quae Carpocrates, Menander, Cerdo, Saturninus, Baſilides, Valentinus, et Marcion de angelis et aeonibus, inter quos erant Charis, Alethea, Monogenes, Logos, Zoe, item de Chriſto, non vere, ſed δοκήσει paſſo, tradiderunt: ſatis manifeſtum erit, Joannem doctrinam ſuam illis ita opponere, ut loquendi formulis apud illos receptis utatur. *Weiſt. Teſt. Gr. Tom. i. p.* 832.

ſay, *he oppoſed his doctrine to them*, or wrote againſt them, does not ſeem very proper. And if the ancient writers ſpeak not more accuratly, than this learned modern; an argument taken from them, upon this head, cannot be of much weight.

It is the teſtimonie of *Irenaeus*, which ought principally to be regarded by us, upon account of his antiquity, and his having been acquainted with *Polycarp* in the early part of his life. He ſays, as before tranſcribed, "that "by the publication of his Goſpel *John* de- "ſigned to root out the errour, that had been "ſown among men by *Cerinthus*." But it is obſervable, that in another place, alſo tranſcribed above, he ſays: "*John* foreſeeing "thoſe blaſphemous notions, that divide the "Lord, ſo far as it is in their power," wrote his Goſpel. For this paſſage I am indebted to Mr. *Whiſton*, who argues, that St. *John*'s Goſpel was writ about the year 63. and before this Apoſtle's three epiſtles. "Nor, ſays *(b)* "he, ſhall I need to ſupport this obſervation "from any other argument, than that from "*Irenaeus*, who ſuppoſeth this Goſpel, and "St. *Paul*'s epiſtle to the *Romans*, ancienter, "and

(b) Commentarie upon St. John's epiſtles. p. 8.

" and theſe epiſtles later, than the riſe of the " hereſie of *Cerinthus.*" Referring to the paſſage of *Irenaeus*, before taken notice of by us.

If then we put together the ſeveral paſſages of *Irenaeus*, he does not contradict the ſuppoſition of an early date of St. *John*'s Goſpel: or, that it was writ before the riſe of thoſe hereſies, which may be confuted by it.

It may be judged preſumptuous to oppoſe the prevailing opinion of learned men, who have ſuppoſed, that ſome heretics were particularly ſtruck at in the begining of this Goſpel. Nevertheleſs Mr. *Lampe (i)* whom I have often quoted, has preſumed to oppoſe this opinion, and has largely argued, that St. *John* did not write againſt *Cerinthus*, or other heretics

(i) Nos ut ſalva, quam viris magnis, ... debemus, exiſtimatione, libere animi ſenſa proferamus, an Evangelio ſuo Joannes controverſiam tractare, haereticoſque in Eccleſia ſui aevi ullos refutare voluerit, dubitamus admodum. Neque enim id titulus generalis *Evangelii* libro praefixus admittit, neque id commode per librum ad methodum hiſtoriae compoſitum fieri potuit, neque illius rei vel vola vel veſtigium ullum apparet: quod tamen et ſcriptoribus elenchticis in more conſtanti poſitum eſt, et e re admodum erat, ut eo certius tela ferirent, et eo evidentius argumentorum pateſceret robur. *Lampe Prolegom. in Joann. l. 2. cap. 3. num. xiii. Vid. ib. num. xiv. xv. xvi. et ſeq.*

tics in his Goſpel. And though another learned German *(k)* has ſince writ againſt Mr. *Lampe*, I cannot ſay, that he has confuted him.

I ſhall therefore take the liberty to mention ſome thoughts relating to this matter, which offer themſelves to my mind.

Firſt: To me it ſeems below an Evangeliſt, to write againſt heretics in the hiſtorie of his Lord and Maſter. Nor do any of the Evangeliſts enter into a particular account of things after our Lord's aſcenſion. St. *John* proceeds no farther than his reſurrection, and the evidences of it, without particularly mentioning his aſcenſion. Nor has St. *Matthew* proceeded any farther. However, undoubtedly, it is implied in what they write, that our Lord was raiſed up to an endleſs life, and to univerſal power in heaven and on earth. St. Mark ch. xvi. 19. and St. Luke xxiv. 50. 51. relate our Saviour's aſcenſion to heaven.

This has oftentimes appeared to me exceeding remarkable, that none of the Evangeliſts ſhould in their Goſpels give an account of

(k) G. L. Oederus de ſcopo Evangelii S. Jo. Ap. certiſſime Haereſi Cerinthi et Ebionis oppoſiti. Adverſus V. C. Fr. Ad. Lampe. Lipſiae 1732.

of the preaching of the Apoſtles after our Lord's aſcenſion, and the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon them. Take the earlieſt date of the Goſpels, that can be thought of, or aſſigned by any: all muſt allow, that before any of them were writ, many miracles had been performed by the Apoſtles, and many converts muſt have been made from among Jews, if not alſo from among Gentils: and many promiſes of our Lord muſt have been accompliſhed. And we can perceive from their Goſpels, that they had a knowledge of ſuch things. Nevertheleſs there is no particular account of them in any of the Goſpels. St. *Mark* is the only Evangeliſt, that has ſaid any thing in his Goſpel of the miniſtrie of the Apoſtles. And he enters not into any detail. His whole account is in a few words only, the laſt verſe of his Goſpel.

Conſidering this method of all the Evangeliſts in their hiſtories of our Lord and Saviour, it appears to me probable, that though St. *John* had not writ his Goſpel before the year 96. or 97. as ſome have ſuppoſed; he would not have taken notice of heretics, or vouchſafed to argue with them. St. *John* did not write the hiſtorie of the Apoſtles, as

is evident. How then could he take notice of heretics.

Secondly. Another thing of no ſmall moment is this. I ſee nothing of this kind in the reſt of St. *John*'s Goſpel. Why *(l)* then ſhould we imagine, that there is any ſuch thing in the introduction? If St. *John*'s Goſpel is not writ againſt heretics, why ſhould the begining of it be ſo? What St. *John* ſays in the introduction, appears to me agreeable to the main deſign of his Goſpel, as it has been before largely repreſented. He therein ſhews, that Jeſus came, and acted by the authority of God, the Creator of the world, the God, and ſupreme Lawgiver of the Jewiſh People. The *(m)* eternal word, reaſon, wiſdom, power of

(l) Ex quibus clare, ut putamus, patet, in prologo compendium contineri rerum, quas Evangeliſta toto Evangelio demonſtrare volebat, nempe Ieſum non tantum eſſe Filium Dei et redemtorem mundi. Ver. 1. . . 4. Sed etiam qua talem ita plene in mundo demonſtratum eſſe, ut ab una parte Judaei plane rediti fuerint ἀναπολόγητοι. ver. 4. . . 11. ab altera autem fideles ſufficiens fidei firmamentum acceperint ver. 12. . . . 18. *Lamp. Prol. l.* 2. *cap.* 4. *num. xxv.*

(m) Quaeris veram hujus nominis interpretationem, de qua variae exſtant eruditorum virorum ſententiae? Non vindico mihi ejus rei arbitrium: tantum, quod hic ſentio, modeſte, ſalva diſſentientium exiſtimatione et amicitia, profero. Vertendum eſſe hoc nomen *Ratio*, vel *Sapientia Dei*: etſi recep-

tam

of God, which is God himſelf, by which the world had been made, by which he dwelled among the Jews in the tabernacle, and the temple, *(n)* dwelled, and reſided in Jeſus, in the fulleſt manner: ſo *(o)* that we his diſciples, and others who believed in him, ſaw, and clearly diſcerned him to be the promiſed Meſſiah, the great Prophet, that ſhould come into the world.

The Apoſtles in their addreſſes to the Jewiſh People never fail to give aſſurances, that Jeſus Chriſt had acted by the authority of the one true God, the God of their anceſtors.

tam phraſim *Sermonis Dei*, in verſione retinendam cenſuerim. . . . Conſtat cuique, prologum Evangelii legenti, alludere Joannem in toto illo prologo . . ad caput octavum Proverbiorum Salomonis, . . . ut proinde talem eligere oporteat interpretationem, quae affinis ſit voci *Sapientiae*. *Vitring. in Apoc. cap. xix. ver.* 13. *p.* 1109.

(n) Ut celebratiſſimo loco legitur: Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. Quod recte redditur: *Et Verbum*, ſive ſermo, *homo factus eſt*, ſive humanam naturam induit. Et ἐξ ἔργων νόμε δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ: i. e. *homo quiſquam*. Rom. iii. 20. ut Pſ. cxliv. 22. al. cxlv. 21. καὶ εὐλογείτω πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ ὄνομα ἁυτᾶ. *Pearſon. Prolegom. ad verſion. lxx. Cantab. p.* 13.

(o) "We ſaw his glorie, as what became the only begotten Son of God. He did not glitter in any worldly pomp and grandeur, according to what the Jewiſh nation fondly dreamed their Meſſiah would do: but he was decked with the glorie of holineſſe, grace, truth, and the power of miracles." *Lightfoot's Exercitations upon St. John. vol.* 2. *p.* 521.

So Acts ii. 22. *Ye men of Iſrael, hear theſe words: Jeſus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles . . . which God did by him in the midſt of you.* And iii. 13. *The God of Abraham, of Iſaac, and Jacob, The God of our fathers, has glorified his Son, Jeſus....* See alſo ver. 22. . . 26. ch. v. 30. *The God of our fathers has raiſed up Jeſus....* The epiſtle to the *Hebrews* begins in this manner: *God, who at ſundry times, and in divers manners, ſpake in time paſt unto the fathers by the Prophets, has in theſe laſt days ſpoken unto us by his Son.*

Indeed, this is neceſſarie for the ſatisfaction of all men, both Jews and Gentils. For there is no other God, but one, even the God of the Patriarchs and Prophets. Nor can any true revelation come from any, but him.

In all the Goſpels our Lord aſcribes all his miracles, and all his authority, to the one God, *his Father, who is in heaven.* Matt. xii. 28. *If I caſt out demons by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you.* Luke xi. 20. *If I by the finger of God caſt out demons, no doubt the kingdom of God is come unto you.* Matt. xi. 27. *All things are delivered unto me by my Father...* Comp. Luke x. 22. Matt. xii. 13. *Every plant, which my heavenly*

venly Father has not planted, ſhall be rooted up. Matt. xvi. 27. *For the Son of man ſhall come in the glorie of his Father.* . . . . Comp. Mark viii. 38. And the like in many other places.

But in none of the Goſpels does our Lord ſo frequently, and expreſſly, aſcribe all his authority to God the Father, as in St. *John*'s Goſpel: thereby plainly ſhewing the guilt of thoſe, who did not receive him. John v. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do.* . . . . Ver. 30. *I ſeek not my own will, but the will of the Father, who hath ſent me.* Ver. 36. 37. *But I have greater witneſſe, than that of John. For the works, which the Father hath given me to finiſh, the ſame works that I do, bear witneſſe of me, that the Father hath ſent me.* . . . *I am come in my Father's name. And ye receive me not.* . . . . And at ver. 45. . . 47. our Lord appeals to *Moſes* and his writings, which were allowed to be of divine original, as bearing teſtimonie to him. Then ch. vi. 27. . . . *him hath God the Father ſealed.* vii. 16. *I am not alone. But I, and the Father, that ſent me.* x. 36. *Say ye of him, whom the Father hath ſanctified, and ſent into the world: Thou blaſphemeſt: becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* And, to add no more. Ch. xi. 41. 42. When he

wrought that great miracle of raiſing *Lazarus* from the dead, *Jeſus lift up his eyes, and ſaid: Father, I thank thee, that thou haſt heard me. And I knew, that thou heareſt me always. But becauſe of the people which ſtand by, I ſaid it, that they may believe, that thou haſt ſent me.*

Agreeable to all this is the introduction, where, beſide other, are theſe expreſſions: *He came to his own. And his own received him not. . . . The Word was made fleſh, and dwelled among us. . . . And we ſaw his glorie, the glorie, as of the only begotten of the Father. . . The law was given by Moſes. But grace and truth came by Jeſus Chriſt. No man hath ſeen God at any time. The only begotten Son, who is in the boſom of the Father, he has declared him.* So ends the introduction. And it is what St. *John* has largely and fully ſhewn in his Goſpel.

But it will be aſked: Whence came it to paſs, that St. *John* made uſe of that term, *the Word?*

I anſwer: I am of opinion, that it was not out of regard to *Philo*, or any Platonic writers. But I ſuppoſe, this *(p)* way of ſpeak-

(p) Plerique obſervant, ſimilem locutionem frequenter occurrere in Paraphraſibus Chaldaicis, quae veterum Hebraeorum

ſpeaking to have been very common with the Jewiſh People, and, perhaps, more eſpecially with thoſe of them, who were moſt zealous for the law, and moſt exempt from foreign, and philoſophical ſpeculations. Who by *the Word*, or *the Word of God*, underſtood, not a ſpirit, ſeparate from God, and inferior to him, but God himſelf, as St. *John (q)* does.

Numb.

rum catecheſin, et antiquas loquendi formulas, exhibent. Quoties de Deo nobiſcum converſante ſermo eſt, toties vero Targumiſtae, pro Deo, vel Jehova, ſubſtituerunt *verbum Jehovae*. Pro exemplo haec paucula ex innumeris ſunto. Gen. xxi. 20. *Deus fuit cum illo.* Onkelos. *Verbum Domini fuit illi auxilio.* Ib. comm. 22. *Deus eſt tecum.* Onkelos. Verbum Domini enim *tibi ſubſidio.* Deut. xx. 1. *Ne timeto ab eis. Nam Deus tuus tecum eſt.* Onkelos. . . *eo quod* Jehova *Deus tuus, Verbum ejus auxilio tibi eſt, quod eduxit te ex terra Aegypti.* Num. xi. 22. *Eo quod reprobaſti Jehovam.* Onkelos. *Eo quod faſtidiſtis Verbum Domini, cujus Shechinah Divina Majeſtas habitat in vobis.* Exod. xvi. 8. *Non contra nos murmurationes veſtrae, ſed contra Jehovam.* Onkelos. . . *ſed contra Verbum Jevae.* Infinita ſunt ſimilia. Unde colligitur, receptum eo tempore Hebraeis fuiſſe, ut Deum, quatenus cum populo ſuo agit, Verbum vocaverint: cui ea attribuerunt, quae Dei ſunt. *Witſ. Miſcell. Sacr. Tom. 2. p. 88. 89. Exercita. iii. περὶ τ῀ λόγ῀. §. ii.*

(q) Omnia igitur talia conſcribere volens diſcipulus Domini, et regulam veritatis conſtituere in Eccleſia quia eſt unus Deus Omnipotens, qui per Verbum ſuum omnia fecit, et viſibilia, et inviſibilia: ſignificans quoque, quoniam per

Numb. xxiii. 8. *How ſhall I curſe, whom God has not curſed? or, how ſhall I defy, whom the Lord has not defied?* Upon which verſe *Patrick* ſays: " In the Jeruſalem Targum " this verſe is thus paraphraſed: *How ſhall I* " *curſe the houſe of Iſrael, when the Word of* " *the Lord has bleſſed them? Or, how ſhall I* " *diminiſh the familie of Iſrael, when the Word* " *of the Lord has multiplied them?*"

It is well known, that in the Chaldee Paraphraſes, it is very common, to put *Mimra Jehovah, the Word of the Lord*, for *Jehovah*, or *God*. When thoſe Paraphraſes were made, is not certain: whether before, or after the time of our Saviour. But their great antiquity is generally allowed. And it is

Verbum, per quod Deus perfecit conditionem, in hoc et ſalutem his qui in conditione ſunt, praeſtitit hominibus: ſic inchoavit in ea, quae eſt ſecundum Evangelium, doctrina: *In principio erat Verbum. Iren. l. 3. cap. xi. in Maſſuet.*

Et Cerinthus autem quidam in Aſia, non a primo Deo factum eſſe mundum docuit, ſed a Virtute quadam valde ſeparata, et diſtante ab ea Principalitate, quae eſt ſuper omnia. *Id. l. 1. cap. xxv. al. 26. in.*

Deus autem totus exiſtens mens, et totus exiſtens logos, quod cogitat, hoc et loquitur: et quod loquitur, id et cogitat. Cogitatio enim ejus logos, et logos mens, et omnia concludens mens, ipſe et Pater. *Id. l. 2. cap. xxviii. n. 5. p.* 157.

is very probable, that this way of ſpeaking was common, and much uſed before. " It " is likely, ſays a learned friend, that *Mimra* " *Jehovah* was uſed before the Paraphraſes " were committed to writing, becauſe it " would be an unreaſonable thing to uſe a " phraſe, which the common people did not " underſtand. For it is ſuppoſed, that the " Paraphraſes were chiefly made for them."

Let me add, that the uſe of this phraſe, *the Word of God*, or *the Word of the Lord*, as equivalent to *God* himſelf, ſeems to be founded in the original language of the Old Teſtament. In behalf of which I would allege the following texts. Gen. i. 1. *In the begining God created the heavens and the earth.* Ver. 3. *God ſaid: Let there be light. And there was light.* Comp. Pſ. xxxiii. 6. *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hoſt of them by the breath of his mouth.* And Pſ. cv. 19. *Untill the time that his word came: the Word of the Lord tried him.*

When St. *John* ſays ch. i. 1. 2. 3. *In the begining was the Word, and the Word was with God. And the Word was God. The ſame was in the begining with God. All things were made by him. And without him was not any thing*

thing made that was made. He ſeems to allude to *(r)* what *Solomon* ſays of Wiſdom in the book of Proverbs, particularly, the eighth chapter. And how Wiſdom ought to be underſtood, as ſpoken of by *Solomon*, was ſhewn formerly, if I may be allowed to ſay ſo, in *(s)* a diſcourſe upon Prov. viii. 17. Moreover the begining of St. *John*'s Goſpel ſhould be compared with the begining of his firſt Epiſtle, particularly, ch. i. ver. 1. 2.

According to the account now given, what St. *John* ſays at the begining, is a very proper introduction to his Goſpel: where he largely ſhews the guilt of thoſe, who rejected the manifeſtation *(t)* of the Wiſdom, the Word, the Will of God, in the perſon of Jeſus.

Upon the whole, I ſee no reaſon to think, that, in the introduction to his Goſpel, St. *John* oppoſed any Chriſtian hereſies, or had any regard to them.

Conſequently, the foregoing argument, that St. *John*'s Goſpel was writ before the deſtruc-

(r) See the paſſage of Vitringa quoted juſt now, at note (m) p. 434.

(s) See Sermons upon various ſubjects, p. 113. *&c.*

(t) See ch. xliii. vol. 4. *p.* 602. . . 604.

deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, or about the time of that event, remains entire.

XI. I ſhall now mention ſome obſervations upon this Goſpel. *Obſervations upon this Goſpel.*

1. There is no need to ſhew here, particularly, from the Goſpel itſelf, as we did of the former Evangeliſts, that St. *John* did not write his Goſpel, till after converts had been made from among Gentils: becauſe it is allowed by all, that St. *John* did not write, till after the other Evangeliſts, about the time of the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, or afterwards: before which time the Apoſtles muſt have left *Judea*, to go abroad, and preach to Gentils. Nevertheleſs one ſignal paſſage may be here taken notice of, which is not far from the begining of this Goſpel. Ch. i. 11. 12. 13. *He came to his own, and his own received him not: but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the ſons of God, even to them that believe on his name. Which were born not of bloud, nor of the will of the fleſh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* That is, "he came to the Jews, and firſt appeared, "and taught among them, and they generally "rejected him. But upon all who believed "in him, whether Jews or Gentils, of what-"ever countrey, or nation, or people, they

"were,

" were, he beſtowed the privilege of being " the people of God, and all the bleſſings ap- " pertaining to them."

2. *Euſebe* ſays: " The *(t)* other three E- " vangeliſts have recorded the actions of our " Saviour for one year only, after the impri- " ſonment of *John* the Baptiſt." *Jerome* ſpeaks to the like purpoſe in his book of Illuſtrious Men, juſt now *(u)* tranſcribed. But it ſhould have been ſaid: " one year, and ſomewhat more:" meaning the time and actions of our Lord's moſt public miniſtrie. For it ſeems to me, that the ancients ſuppoſed our Lord's miniſtrie, to have laſted, in the whole, ſomewhat more than two years. As was ſhewn Vol. iii. p. 136... 138. *Euſebe* indeed computed *(x)* our Lord's miniſtrie to have conſiſted of three years and a half: and ſuppoſed St. *John*'s Goſpel to have in it four Paſſovers. He ſeems to have been the firſt Chriſtian, who advanced that opinion. And he is now generally followed by harmonizers of the Goſpels, and by eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians. Sir *Iſaac Newton (y)* however computes five Paſſovers

(t) See vol. viii. p. 93.
(u) See before p. 384.
(x) See vol. viii. p. 138.
(y) Obſervations upon Daniel. p. 156. 157.

Paſſovers in our Saviour's miniſtrie: as does likewiſe Dr. *Edward Wells* in his Hiſtorical Geographie of the New Teſtament. And others may be of the ſame opinion, or make more. But none of theſe opinions appear to me, to have any foundation in the Goſpels. The opinion of *Euſebe*, and thoſe who follow him, is much more probable, than theirs, who yet farther enlarge the number of the Paſſovers of our Saviour's miniſtrie. The firſt Paſſover in St. *John* is that mentioned by him ch. ii. 13. At ch. v. 1. it is ſaid: *After this there was a feaſt of the Jews. And Jeſus went up to Jeruſalem.* They who follow *Euſebe*, and make four Paſſovers in our Lord's miniſtrie, reckon this feaſt to be a Paſſover. But they who compute his miniſtrie to have laſted only two years, and ſomewhat more, ſuppoſe this to be ſome other feaſt, poſſibly, the feaſt of Tabernacles, next ſucceding the Paſſover, mentioned ch. ii. 13. At ch. vi. 4. *And the Paſſover, a feaſt of the Jews was nigh.* This, according to different computations, is either the ſecond, or the third Paſſover in our Lord's miniſtrie. The third, or, according to others, the fourth, is that mentioned by all the Evangeliſts, at which our Lord

Lord ſuffered. It is mentioned by St. *John* ch. xi. 55. and xii. 1.

3. St. *John* has omitted the greateſt part of thoſe things, which are recorded by the other Evangeliſts. Which much confirms the teſtimonie of ancient writers, that the firſt three Goſpels were written, and publiſhed among the faithful, before St. *John* wrote: that they were brought to him, and that he affirmed the truth of their relations, but ſaid, that ſome diſcourſes and miracles of our Saviour were omitted by them, which might be uſefully recorded.

Indeed, there is little or nothing in his Goſpel, which is not new and additional, except the account of our Saviour's proſecution, death, and reſurrection, where all four coincide in many particulars: though even here alſo St. *John* has divers things peculiar to himſelf. In St. *John*'s Goſpel is no account of our Saviour's nativity, nor of his baptiſm by *John*: though, undoubtedly, it is there ſuppoſed, and referred to. He takes no notice of our Saviour's temptation in the wilderneſſe, nor of the call, or names of the twelve Apoſtles, nor of their miſſion, in our Saviour's life time, nor of our Lord's parables, or other diſcourſes of his, recorded by them,

nor

nor of our Saviour's journeys, of which they give an account, nor any of thoſe predictions, relating to the deſolations of *Jeruſalem*, which are in *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*. Nor has he any miracles recorded by them, excepting only, that one of the multiplication of ſmall proviſion for feeding five thouſand, with the extraordinarie circumſtances of the return to *Capernaum* from the countrey, where that miracle had been wrought. ch. vi. 4. . . . 21. And it is likely, that this miracle was recorded by him, for the ſake of the diſcourſes, to which it gave occaſion, and which follow there. ver. 22. . . 71.

However, it ſhould be obſerved, that he has one thing recorded by all the Evangeliſts, *Peter*'s ſtriking a ſervant of the High-Prieſt, and cutting off his ear. ch. xviii. 10. *Then Simon Peter having a ſword, drew it, and ſmote the High-Prieſt's ſervant, and cut off his right ear. The ſervant's name was Malchus.* Which, as St. *Luke* informs us, Jeſus touched, and healed. ch. xxii. 51. *Peter*'s action is mentioned by all the three Evangeliſts. Matt. xxvi. 51. Mark xiii. 47. Luke xxii. 51. But St. *John* alone mentions *Peter* by name, and the name of the ſervant. I thought proper to take notice of this, though St. John does

does not particularly mention the miracle of healing.

St. *John* likewiſe ch. ii. 14...22. gives an account of our Lord's cleanſing the temple at his firſt Paſſover, when he went to *Jeruſalem*. All the other Evangeliſts have a like account of our Lord's cleanſing the temple at his laſt Paſſover. Matt. xxi. 12. 13. Mark xi. 15. 16. Luke xix. 45. 46. But I ſuppoſe them to be quite different actions, and that our bleſſed Lord twice cleanſed the temple, as already ſhewn.

4. Though the firſt three Evangeliſts have not particularly recorded our Saviour's ſeveral journeys to *Jeruſalem*, as St. *John* has done, but have only given a particular account of his preaching there at his laſt Paſſover, they were not unacquainted with them.

This may be concluded from divers things in their hiſtories. To thoſe, who came to apprehend him, our Lord ſaid: *I ſat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me.* Matt. xxvi. 55. And compare Mark xiv. 49. Luke xxii. 53. And among the accuſations brought againſt him by the Jewiſh Rulers before *Pilate*, they ſay: *He ſtirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, begining from Galilee to this place.*

Luke

Luke xxiii. 5. *Peter* preaching at *Jeruſalem*, ſoon after our Lord's aſcenſion, ſays: *Jeſus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and ſigns: which God did by him in the midſt of you, as yourſelves alſo know.* Acts ii. 32. And at the houſe of *Cornelius*, in *Ceſarea: That word, you know, which was publiſhed throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee.* Acts x. 37. . . . *And we are witneſſes of all things, which he did, both in the land of the Jews, and at Jeruſalem.* ver. 39. And it appears from their hiſtories, that our Lord's fame had early reached *Jeruſalem*. Many attended him in *Galilee*, from thence, and from other parts. Says St. *Matthew: And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Judea, and from beyond Jordan.* iv. 25. Comp. Mark iii. 7. 8. Again: *And the Scribes, which came from Jeruſalem, ſaid: He has Belzebub.* . . Mark iii. 22. . . 30. Compare Matt. ix. 34. Luke xi. 14. . . 26. *Then came to Jeſus Scribes and Phariſees, which were of Jeruſalem.* Matt. xv. 1. Compare Mark vii. 1. And ſays St. *Luke* ch. v. 17. *And it came to paſs on a certain day, as he was teaching, that there were Phariſees, and Doctors of the Law ſitting by, which were come out*

of every town of Galilee, and Judea, and Jeruſalem. And the power of the Lord was preſent to heal them. And in every one of the Evangeliſts we may meet with Scribes and Phariſees, oppoſing our Lord, watching his words and actions, cavilling with him, and reflecting upon him, and his diſciples.

Moreover in St. *Luke* ch. ix. 51. . . 56. is an account of a remarkable incident, when our Lord was going from *Galilee* through *Samaria*, to *Jeruſalem*, at one of their feaſts: ſuppoſed by *(z)* ſome to be the feaſt of Tabernacles, by others *(a)* the feaſt of Dedication, preceding his laſt Paſſover. See likewiſe Luke xiii. 22. and xvii. 11.

However, after all, I do not think it was needful, that our Lord ſhould go often to *Jeruſalem*, or that all his journeys thither, and diſcourſes there, ſhould be recorded. It was indeed highly expedient, that his miniſtrie ſhould be public. So it might be, without going often to *Jeruſalem*. *John* the Baptiſt was a man of great reputation, though he never went up to *Jeruſalem* during the time of *his ſhewing* himſelf *unto Iſrael*, that we know

Luke i. 80.

(z) Vid. Cleric. Harmon. p. 234. 235.

(a) See Dr. Doddridge's Family Expoſitor. Sect. 127. *Vol.* 2. *p.* 183.

know of. And it is manifeſt from the firſt three Evangeliſts, as well as from St. *John*, that our Lord's miniſtrie was very public, and well known in all parts of *Judea*, and the regions round about, and to men of all ranks therein. In them we find our Lord to have been notified before-hand by *John* the Baptiſt. He ſent out once his twelve Apoſtles, and then ſeventy other diſciples, *two by two, to go before him, and prepare men for him, in every city and place, where he ſhould come.* In them we find him teaching in ſynagogues, in cities, and villages, and deſert places, crouded by throngs, attended by multitudes of people, and miraculouſly feeding at one time five thouſand, at another four thouſand men, beſide women and children.

It was fit, that our Lord's miniſtrie ſhould be very public. It is manifeſt from all the four Evangeliſts, that it was ſo. Which cannot but be the ground of great ſatisfaction to us.

5. The genuinneſſe of the xxi. or laſt chapter of St. *John*'s Goſpel ought not to be conteſted.

Grotius indeed was of opinion, that *(b)* St.

(b) Omnino arbitror, quae hic ſequuntur concluſionem eſſe totius

John concluded his Goſpel with the words, which are at the end of the xx. chapter: and that what is in the xxi. chapter was added after St. *John*'s death by the church of *Epheſus*.

Againſt that opinion the general, or *(c)* even univerſal conſent of manuſcripts and verſions is a great objection. For it is very probable, that this Goſpel was publiſhed before St. *John*'s death. And if there had been an edition without this chapter, it is very likely, that it would have been wanting in ſome copies. To which may be added, that we do not find, that any of the ancient Chriſtian writers ever made a queſtion, whether this chapter was compoſed by St. *John*, or

totius operis, et ibi finiſſe Johannem librum, quem edidit. At ſicut caput ultimum Pentateuchi, et caput ultimum Joſuae poſt Moſis et Joſuae mortem additum eſt a Synedrio Hebraeorum: ita et caput quod ſequitur poſt mortem Johannis additum ab Eccleſia Epheſina, hoc maxime fine, ut oſtenderetur impletum quod de longaevitate ac non violenta morte Johannis Dominus praedixerat. &c. *Grot. ad Joh. xx.* 30.

(c) Ceterum in tanto codicum et verſionum conſenſu, eoque prorſus univerſali, cogitari non debebat, caput hoc ab Eccleſia demum Epheſina acceſſiſſe. Quis enim negare tuto poteſt, Evangelium Johannis ante ipſius obitum, adeoque ante additum hoc, quod creditur, ſupplementum acceſſiſſe? Et quis crediderit, vel ſic omnes codices in exhibendo iſto capite tam conſtanter conſentire potuiſſe? *Wolf. in Joh. cap. xxi. in.*

or by another. Finally, *(d)* the ſtile is St. *John*'s. In chapter xix. 35. *And he that ſaw it bare record. And his record is true. And he knoweth, that he ſays true.* Here xxi. 24. *This is the diſciple, which teſtifieth of theſe things, and wrote theſe things. And we know, that his teſtimonie is true.* Compare likewiſe ver. 7. and 20. The laſt words of the chapter, at ver. 25. are theſe: *And there are alſo many other things, which Jeſus did: the which if they ſhould be written every one, I ſuppoſe, that even the world itſelf could not contain the books that ſhould be written.* Which clauſe evidently is from the ſame perſon, who wrote ver. 30. and 31. of ch. xx. Here the Evangeliſt ſeems to check himſelf, and to determine, not to proceed any farther. For if he

(d) Rejicimus hic ſententiam eorum, qui ab alia manu, quam ipſius Johannis Evangeliſtae hoc caput eſſe adjectum putant. Nam ita clare ſtilum redolet Apoſtoli, ut ſi aliquis alius id adjeciſſet, non ſine impoſtura iſtud facere potuiſſet. Neque enim ſe Joannem vocat, ſed more ſuo diſcipulum, quem Ieſus amabat. ver. 7. 20. Tum haec addit: *Hic eſt diſcipulus ille, qui de his teſtatur, et haec ſcripſit.* ver. 24. Quae defendi non poſſunt a mendacio, ſi quiſquam alius praeter Apoſtolum hoc caput adjeciſſet. Adde, quod diligentiſſimi circa tales circumſtantias Patres, Euſebius, Hieronymus, atque alii, non ita plene ſilentio id involviſſent. &c. *Fr. Lamp. in Jo. Evang. cap. xxi. Tom. 3. p. 720. 721. Vid. et Mill. Proleg. num.* 249. 250.

ſhould attempt to commit to writing every thing which Jeſus had ſaid and done, he ſhould never come to an end.

Says Dr. *Whitby* upon ch. xx. 31. "Some "think, that St. *John* here ended his Goſpel, "and that the following chapter was written "by ſome other hands. But theſe words "give no ground for that imagination: ſince "other Apoſtles, after they ſeem to have con-"cluded their epiſtles, add ſome new matter: "as may be ſeen in the concluſions of the "epiſtles to the *Romans*, and to the *Hebrews*." See Rom. ch. xv. and xvi. Hebr. xiii. 21... 25. I would likewiſe refer to Mr. *Lenfant*'s note upon ch. xxi. 24. Who alſo aſſerts the genuinneſſe of this laſt chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The Queſtion conſidered, whether any one of the firſt three Evangeliſts had ſeen the Goſpels of the others, before he wrote.

HERE I ſhall in the firſt place mention the different ſentiments of learned moderns concerning this point. And then I intend to conſider the merits of the queſtion.

Calvin (a) in the preface to his Harmonie of the Goſpels of *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*, declares it to be his opinion, that St. *Mark* was ſo far from having abridged St.

(a) Mihi certe magis probabile eſt, et ex re ipſa conjicere licet, numquam librum Matthaei fuiſſe ab eo inſpectum, cum ipſe ſuum ſcriberet: tantum abeſt, ut in compendium ex profeſſo redigere voluerit. Idem et de Luca judicium facio. *Calvin. argum. in Evangel. &c.*

Matthew's Goſpel, that he thinks he had never ſeen it. Which he alſo ſuppoſes to have been St. *Luke*'s caſe.

This likewiſe muſt have been the opinion of *Baſnage*. For he ſuppoſeth *(b)* St. *Luke*'s to have been the firſt written of all the Goſpels. Conſequently this Evangeliſt could not borrow either from St. *Matthew*, or St. *Mark*.

Mr. *Whiſton* in *(c)* his Harmonie of the four Evangeliſts called St. *Mark the epitomizer of St. Matthew*. Mr. *Jones*, in his Vindication of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, well, and largely argued againſt that opinion.

Mr. *Dodwell* declared his opinion upon this ſubject after this manner. "That *(d)* none "of

(b) Baſn. Ann. 60. *num. xxxi.*

(c) P. 102.

(d) Sic latuerant in illis terrarum angulis, in quibus ſcripta fuerant, Evangelia, ut ne quidem reſciverint recentiores Evangeliſtae, quid ſcripſiſſent de iiſdem rebus antiquiores. Aliter foret ne tot eſſent ἐναντιοφανῆ, quae fere a prima uſque canonis conſtitutione eruditorum hominum ingenia exercuerint. Certe S. Lucas ſi genealogiam illam Domini in Matthaeo vidiſſet, non aliam ipſe, nihilque fere habentem commune, produxiſſet, ne quidem minima conſilii tam diverſi edita ratione. S. Matthaeus, qui ſolus e noſtris Luca erat antiquior, ipſe erat αὐτόπτης. . . . S. Joannes Luca longo erat intervallo in ſcriptione

" of the firſt three Evangeliſts had ſeen the " others Goſpels. Otherwiſe there could not " have been in them ſo many ſeeming con- " tradictions, which have exerciſed the " thoughts of inquiſitive men almoſt ever " ſince the forming of the canon of the New " Teſtament. Certainly, if St. *Luke* had ſeen " the genealogie of our Lord, which is in St. " *Matthew*, he would not have publiſhed " another ſo very different, without aſſigning " any reaſon for it. . . St. *Matthew* is the only " one of our Evangeliſts, who wrote before " St. *Luke*. . . St. *John* did not write till long " after St. *Luke*. Nor did *Mark* write till af- " ter St. *Luke*, if he wrote his Goſpel in the " ſame year that he finiſhed the Acts of the " Apoſtles. Which ſeems to me very pro- " bable. For the Acts are the ſecond book of " the ſame work. As is evident from what " himſelf

ſcriptione junior. Junior etiam S. Marcus, ſi quidem S. Lucas eo ſcripſerit anno Evangelium, quo Acta terminavit Apoſtolorum. Quod ego ſane puto veriſimillimum. Sunt enim Acta Δεύτερος ejuſdem operis λόγος, cujus πρῶτον λόγον ipſe ſuum agnoſcit Evangelium. Act. i. 1. . . Ita quo anno ſcriptum eſt a S. Luca Evangelium ſecundus fluxerit Apoſtolo Paulo annus captivitatis Romanae. Eo enim uſque Actorum hiſtoria perducta eſt. S. autem Marcus, ſeu poſt obitum Petri, ſeu non multo antea, ſcripſiſſe videtur. *Dodw. Diſſ. Iren. i. num. xxxix.*

" himself says Acts i. 1. St. *Luke*'s Gospel " therefore was writ in the second year of the " Apostle *Paul*'s imprisonment at *Rome*. For " so far the historie of the Acts reaches. But " St. *Mark* seems not to have writ untill af- " ter the death of St. *Peter*, or not long before " it." This then is the order of the four Evangelists, according to Mr. *Dodwell*: *Matthew* the first, *Luke* the second, *Mark* the third, and *John* the fourth.

How Mr. *Le Clerc* argued on the same side, was seen *(e)* formerly.

On the other hand, *Grotius* says, it *(f)* is manifest from comparing their Gospels, that *Mark* made use of *Matthew*.

Mill has spoken largely to this point in his Prolegomena. " He says, it *(g)* was not the " design of St. *Mark*, to make an abridge- " ment

(e) See Vol. x. p. 231. . . . 235.

(f) Usum esse Marcum Matthaei Evangelio apertum facit collatio. *Grot. ad Marc. cap. i. ver.* 1.

(g) Ipsam Evangelii structuram quod attinet, neutiquam Marco institutum fuit, quod nonnullis videtur, Evangelium Matthaei in epitomen redigere. Praeterquam enim quod servatum a Matthaeo ordinem non ubique sequatur, quod sane epitomatoris foret, in ejusdem rei narratione Matthaeo haud raro prolixior est, ac plurima passim inserta habet, eaque subinde magni ad elucidandam historiam momenti. *Proleg. num.* 103.

" ment of St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, as ſome have
" ſuppoſed. For he does not always follow
" St. *Matthew*'s order, as an abridger would
" have done. And he is oftentimes more
" prolix in his hiſtories of the ſame thing
" than St. *Matthew*, and has inſerted many
" additional things, and ſome of great mo-
" ment for illuſtrating the evangelical hiſtorie.
" . . . Nay *(h)* ſo far was *Mark* from intend-
" ing to abbreviate St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, that
" there have been men of great fame, as *Cal-*
" *vin*, and our *Dodwell*, who were of opi-
" nion, that St. *Mark* and *Luke* had never ſeen
" *Matthew*'s Goſpel. However, *Grotius* was
" of a different opinion. And indeed the
" great reſemblance of the ſtile and compoſi-
" tion of theſe two Evangeliſts manifeſts the
" truth of it."

Of St. *Luke Mill* ſays: " Nothing *(i)* is
" more

(h) Imo certe adeo nihil Marco erat in animo de abbreviando Matthaei Evangelio, ut haud deſint magni nominis auctores, qui exiſtimant, a Marco ne quidem viſum fuiſſe Evangelium Matthaei. . . . Ceterum contrarium evincit, Evangelium imprimis Matthaei et Marci quod attinet, iſtorum phraſeos, ipſiuſque contextus ſimilitudo. *Ibid. n.* 107.

(i) Certe evulgatum fuiſſe illud poſt editionem Evangeliorum Matthaei et Marci, ex collatione trium horum inter ſe luce clarius apparet. Nihil ſcilicet evidentius, quam D. Lucam

" more evident, than that he made uſe of the " Goſpels of *Matthew* and *Mark*. For he has " borrowed from them many phraſes and ex- " preſſions, and even whole paragraphs word " for word."

But there is not ſufficient foundation for ſuch ſtrong aſſertions, in the account, which *Mill* himſelf gives of the time of writing the firſt three Goſpels. For, according to him, St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel was publiſhed in *(k)* the year 61. St. *Mark*'s *(l)* in 63. St. *Luke*'s *(m)* in 64. Which is but one year later. Nor has *Mill* made it out, that St. *Mark*'s was publiſhed ſo ſoon as the year 63. For he owns, that it was not writ, till after *Peter*'s and *Paul*'s departure from *Rome*. Which could not be, till after the year 63. How then could St. *Luke* make ſo much uſe of St. *Mark*'s Goſpel, as is pretended?

I allege but one author more, relating to this point. Mr. *Wetſtein* ſays, that *(n) Mark* made uſe of *Matthew*. And of St. *Luke* he ſays,

cam Enangeliorum Matthaei et Marci ipſus ῥήσεις, phraſes et locutiones, imo vero totas pericopas, in ſuum nonnunquam ἀυτολεξεὶ traduxiſſe. *Ib. num.* 116.

(k) Proleg. num. 61. *(l) Ibid. num.* 101.

(m) Ibid. num. 112.

(n) De Marco ap. T. Gr. T. i. p. 552.

ſays, " that *(o)* he tranſcribed many things from *Matthew*, and yet more from *Mark*."

But may I not ſay, that before Mr. *Wetſtein* aſſerted ſuch things, he ſhould have given at leſt ſome tolerable account of the times, when the Evangeliſts wrote, and that St. *Mark* was prior in time to *Luke?* Which I do not perceive him to have done. St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, indeed, he ſuppoſes to have been writ *(p)* in the eighth year after our Lord's aſcenſion. But of St. *Luke* he obſerves, that *(q)* eccleſiaſtical writers ſay, he publiſhed his Goſpel at about fifteen, or as others about two and twenty years after our Saviour's aſcenſion. His account of St. *Mark* is, " that *(r)* he was with *Peter* at *Babylon*. " Thence he came to *Rome*, and was with " St. *Paul* during his captivity there. Col. iv. " 10.

(o) Lucam multa ex Matthaeo, ex Marco plura deſcripſiſſe, ex collatione patet. *De Luca ibid. p.* 643.

(p) Ibid p. 223.

(q) Ibid p. 643.

(r) Poſtea videtur Petro adhaeſiſſe, et cum eo Babylone fuiſſe. 1. Pet. v. 13. Inde Romam venit, Paulumque captivum inviſit. Col. iv. 10. Philem. 23. Inde ad Coloſſenſes abiit, a quibus rogatu Pauli Romam rediit. 2. Tim. iv. 11. ubi Evangelium conſcripſiſſe, et Matthaeum quidem in compendium redegiſſe, nonnulla vero, quae a Petro audiverat, adjeciſſe dicitur. *Ibid. p.* 551.

" 10. Philem. 23. Then he went to *Coloſſe*. " Afterwards at the deſire of the Apoſtle " he came to him thence to *Rome*. 2 *Tim*. iv. " 11. Where he is ſaid to have writ his " Goſpel, abridging St. *Matthew*, and adding " ſome things, which he had heard from " *Peter*." A very fine character of our Evangeliſt, truly! But according to this account of St. *Mark*'s travels, and of the place, where his Goſpel was writ, it could not be publiſhed before the year 64. or 65. How then could St. *Luke* make uſe of it, if he wrote ſo ſoon as *fifteen* or *two and twenty years* after Chriſt's aſcenſion?

I proceed now to ſpeak more diſtinctly to the merits of the queſtion.

1. It does not appear, that any of the learned ancient Chriſtian writers had a ſuſpicion, that any of the firſt three Evangeliſts had ſeen the others hiſtories, before they wrote.

They ſay indeed, " that when the three firſt written Goſpels had been delivered to all men, they were alſo brought to St. *John*, and that he confirmed the truth of their narration: but ſaid, there were ſome things omitted by them, which might be profitably related:" or, " that he wrote laſt, ſupplying ſome things, which had been omitted by the former

mer Evangeliſts." After this manner ſpeak *(s) Euſebius* of *Ceſarea*, *(t) Epiphanius*, *(u) Theodore* of *Mopſueſtia*, and *(x) Jerome*. Not now to mention any others. *Auguſtin* indeed about the end of the fourth centurie, or the begining of the fifth, ſuppoſeth *(y)* the firſt three Evangeliſts not to have been totally ignorant of each others labours, and conſiders *Mark*'s Goſpel as an abridgement of St. *Matthew*'s. But, as *(z)* formerly obſerved, ſo far as I know, he is the firſt, in which that opinion is found. Nor does it appear, that he was followed by ſucceding writers.

2. It is not ſuitable to the character of any of the Evangeliſts, that they ſhould abridge, or tranſcribe another hiſtorian.

St. *Matthew* was an Apoſtle, and eye-witneſſe. Conſequently, he was able to write of his own knowledge. Or, if there were any parts of our Lord's miniſtrie, at which he was not preſent, he might obtain information from his fellow-apoſtles, or other eye-witneſſes. And as for other things, which happened before the Apoſtles were called to follow

(s) See Vol. viii. p. 92. *(t) P. 307.*
(u) Vol. ix. p. 404. *(x) Vol. x. p. 98. 99.*
(y) Vol. x. p. 229. *(z) P. 236.*

low him, concerning his nativity, infance, and youth: as *Auguſtin (a)* ſays, theſe the Apoſtles might know from Chriſt himſelf, or from his parents, or his friends and acquaintance, who were to be depended upon.

St. *Mark*, if he was not one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples, was an early Jewiſh believer, acquainted with all the Apoſtles, *Peter* in particular, and with many other eye-witneſſes. Conſequently, well qualified to write a Goſpel. *Mill (b)* himſelf has been ſo good, as to acknowledge this.

St. *Luke*, if he was not one of Chriſt's ſeventy diſciples, nor an eye-witneſſe, was a diſciple, and companion of Apoſtles, eſpecially, of *Paul*, as is univerſally allowed. And he

(a) See Vol. x. p. 227.

(b) Marcus ille, quiſquis fuerit, ad Evangelium conſcribendum abunde inſtructus accedebat. Si enim filius fuit Mariae, civis iſtius Hieroſolymitanae . . . ei ſane jam a tempore converſionis tam frequens interceſſerat, ac plane familiare cum ipſis Apoſtolis commercium, ut vix aliqua aetatis ſuae pars ipſorum conſortio vacarit: ita ut quotidie ab illis petere licuerit de dictis ac factis Domini παραδόσεις, quas conferret in commentarium. Sane, quiſquis fuerit hic Marcus, apud Veteres plane convenit, fuiſſe eum D. Petri comitem et interpretem: ipſumque comitatum fuiſſe Romam uſque . . . adeo ut ex Apoſtoli κηρυσσομένοις acceperit neceſſe ſit pleniſſimam et exactiſſimam hiſtoriae totius evangelicae cognitionem. *Mill Proleg. n.* 102.

he muſt therefore have been well qualified to write a Goſpel. Moreover, as *(c)* has been ſhewn, it is manifeſt from his introduction, that he knew not of any authentic hiſtorie of Jeſus Chriſt, that had been yet written. And he expreſſly ſays of himſelf, *that he had perfect underſtanding of all things from the very firſt*, and he profeſſeth *to write of them to Theophilus in order*. After all this to ſay, that he tranſcribed many things from one hiſtorian, and yet more from another, ſo far as I am able to judge, is no leſs than a contradiction of the Evangeliſt himſelf.

3. The nature and deſign of the firſt three Goſpels manifeſtly ſhew, that the Evangeliſts had not ſeen any authentic written hiſtorie of Jeſus Chriſt.

This is one of the obſervations of *Le Clerc* relating to this point: "We *(d)* can ſcarcely "doubt, whether St. *John* had ſeen the other "three Goſpels. For as he is ſaid to have "lived to a great age, ſo it appears from his "Goſpel itſelf, that he took care not to repeat "things related by them, except a few only, "and thoſe neceſſarie things. But I do not

(c) See before p. 80. . . 85.
(d) See Vol. x. p. 233. 234.

" ſee, how it can be reckoned certain, that " *Mark* knew of *Matthew*'s having writ a " Goſpel before him: or that *Luke* knew, " that they two had writ Goſpels before him. " If *Mark* had ſeen the work of *Matthew*, it " is likely, that he would have remained ſa- " tisfied with it, as being the work of an A- " poſtle of Chriſt, that is, an eye-witneſſe, " which he was not." And what there follows.

I muſt enlarge upon this obſervation. I forbear to inſiſt now on the genealogies, which are in St. *Matthew* and St. *Luke* only. But I ſay, that the writings of all and each one of theſe three Evangeliſts contain an entire Goſpel, or a compleat hiſtorie of the miniſtrie of Jeſus Chriſt: or, to borrow St. *Luke*'s expreſſions, Acts i. 1. 2. a hiſtorie of *all that Jeſus both did and taught, untill the day, in the which he was taken up to heaven.* For in all and every one of them is the hiſtorie of our Lord's forerunner, his baptiſm, preaching, and death, and of our Lord's being baptized by him: when by a voice from heaven he was proclaimed to be the Meſſiah. Then follows our Lord's temptation in the wilderneſſe. After which is an account of our Lord's preaching, and his begining to gather diſciples,

ciples, the choice of the twelve Apoſtles, and their names: and our Lord's going over the land of *Iſrael*, preaching the doctrine of the kingdom, attended by his twelve Apoſtles, in ſynagogues, and in cities and villages, working all kinds of healing and ſaving miracles, upon all ſorts of perſons, in all places, in the preſence of multitudes, and before Scribes, and Phariſees, as well as others. A particular miſſion of his Apoſtles, in the land of *Iſrael*. Our Lord's tranſiguration on the mount, when there appeared *Moſes* and *Elias* talking with him, and there came a voice from heaven, ſaying: *This is my beloved Son. Hear him.* His going up to *Jeruſalem*, and making a public entrance into the city, then cleanſing the temple, where he often taught the people, and preached the goſpel, and openly aſſerted his authority and character: keeping the Paſſover with his diſciples, and inſtituting a memorial of himſelf: his laſt ſufferings, and death, with the behaviour of *Judas*, the traitor, *Peter*, and the reſt of the diſciples: his burial, reſurrection, with the evidences of it, and the general commiſſion to his Apoſtles, to preach the Goſpel in all the world, and to all ſorts of perſons therein.

Here are all the integrals of a Goſpel. And they are properly filled up. And all theſe things are in all and every one of the firſt three Evangeliſts. Which ſhews, that they did not know of each others writings. For it cannot be thought, that they ſhould be diſpoſed to ſay the ſame things over and over, or to repeat what had been well ſaid already. St. *John*, who had ſeen the other three Goſpels, has little in common with them. Almoſt every thing in his Goſpel is new and additional. So it would have been with every other writer in the like circumſtance.

And if St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel had been writ at about eight, or fifteen, or twenty years after our Lord's aſcenſion, and had become generally known among the faithful: (as it certainly would, ſoon after it was writ:) it is not improbable, that we ſhould have had but two Goſpels, his and St. *John*'s. Or if there had been ſeveral, they would all, except the firſt, have been in the manner of ſupplements, like St. *John*'s, not entire Goſpels, like thoſe of the firſt three Evangeliſts.

This conſideration appears to me of great moment, for ſhewing that our firſt three Evangeliſts are all independent witneſſes. Indeed

deed it ſeems to me to be quite ſatisfactorie, and deciſive.

3. There are in theſe three Goſpels, as was obſerved juſt now by Mr. *Dodwell*, many ſeeming contradictions: which have exerciſed the ſkill of thoughtfull men to reconcile them. This is another argument, that theſe Evangeliſts did not write by concert, or after having ſeen each others Goſpels.

5. In ſome hiſtories, which are in all theſe three Evangeliſts, there are ſmall varieties and differences, which plainly ſhew the ſame thing. I ſhall allege two or three inſtances only.

1.) In Matth. viii. 28... 34. Mark v. 1... 20. Luke viii. 26... 40. is the account of the cure of the demoniac, or demoniacs, in the countrey of the *Gadarens*. It is plainly the ſame hiſtorie, as appears from many agreeing circumſtances. Nevertheleſs there are ſeveral differences. St. *Matthew* ſpeaks of two men. St. *Mark* and St. *Luke* of one only. In *Mark* alone it is ſaid, that the man *was always night and day in the mountains, crying, and cutting himſelf with ſtones*. And he alone mentions the number of the ſwine that were drowned. He likewiſe ſays, that the man *be-*

ſought our Lord *much, that he would not ſend them away out of the countrey.* St. *Luke* ſays: *the demons beſought him, that he would not command them to go out into the deep,* or abyſſe. Surely theſe Evangeliſts did not abridge, or tranſcribe each others writings.

2.) In Matt. xvii. 1... 13. Mark ix. 1... 13. Luke ix. 28... 36. are the accounts of our Lord's transfiguration on the mount. Where St. *Matthew* ſays: *his face did ſhine as the ſun, and his raiment was white as the light.* St. *Mark: And his raiment became ſhining, exceeding white as ſnow, ſo as no fuller on earth can white them.* St. *Luke: And as he prayed, the faſhion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glittering.* It is plain, I think, that none had ſeen what the other had writ. In the deſcription of the ſplendour of our Lord's perſon, and garments, each one follows his own phanſie. In St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* are compariſons. But they are different. In St. *Luke* there is no compariſon at all.

3.) The third inſtance ſhall be what follows next in all the three Evangeliſts, after our Lord was come down from the mount. Matt. xvii. 14... 21. Mark ix. 14... 29.

Luke

Luke ix. 37. . . 42. In this hiſtorie of the healing the young man, who had the epilepſie, where St. *Mark* is more particular and prolix, than the other Evangeliſts, there are many differences. I take notice of a very few only. In St. *Matthew* the father of the child ſays: *Lord, have mercie on my Son. For he is lunatic, and ſore vexed.* And the healing him is thus related. *And Jeſus rebuked the demon. And he departed out of him. And the child was cured from that very hour.* In St. *Mark* the father of the child ſays to our Lord: *Maſter, I have brought unto thee my ſon, who has a dumb ſpirit.* And when our Lord healed him, *he rebuked the foul ſpirit, ſaying unto him: Thou dumb and deaf ſpirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him.* And what follows. In St. *Luke* the father ſays: *Maſter, I beſeech thee, look upon my ſon. For he is my only child.*

Certainly, he who obſerves theſe things, muſt be ſenſible, that theſe hiſtorians did not borrow from each other. There are many other like inſtances. To mention them all would be endleſs.

I ſhall add a conſideration or two more, which muſt be allowed to be of ſome weight in this queſtion.

6. There are ſome things in St. *Matthew*'s Goſpel, very remarkable, of which no notice is taken either by St. *Mark*, or St. *Luke*.

I intend, particularly, the viſit of the Magians, with the cauſes of it, and it's circumſtances, and then the conſequences of it, our Saviour's flight into *Egypt*, and the ſlaughter of the infants at *Bethlehem*, and near it. Matt. ii. The dream of *Pilate*'s wife. ch. xxvii. 19. the affair of the Roman guard at the ſepulchre. xxviii. 11. . . 15. *an earthquake, rending of rocks*, and *the reſurrection of many ſaints, who came out of their graves, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many*. ch. xxvii. 51. . . . 53.

Theſe are as extraordinarie things, as any in the Goſpels. And if St. *Mark*, or St. *Luke*, hid writ with a view of abridging, or confirming St. *Matthew*'s hiſtorie, ſome, or all of theſe things, would have been taken notice of by them. It is alſo very obſervable, that St. *Luke* has no account of the miracle of feeding *four thouſand with ſeven loaves and a few little fiſhes*, which is in Matt. xv. 32. . . 39. Mark viii. 1. . . . 9.

And what has been juſt now ſaid of St. *Matthew*, particularly, may be alſo applied to

to St. *Luke*, ſuppoſing his to have been the firſt written Goſpel. For in him alſo are many remarkable things, not to be found in the other Goſpels. And if St. *Matthew* or St *Mark* had writ with a view of abridging or confirming St. *Luke*'s hiſtorie, thoſe things would not have been paſſed over by them without any notice.

7. All the firſt three Evangeliſts have many things peculiar to themſelves. Which ſhews, that they did not borrow from each other, and that they were all well acquainted with the things, of which they undertook to write a hiſtorie.

Many ſuch things are in *Matthew*, as is well known to all. I therefore need not enlarge on them. And a few of them were juſt now taken notice of.

St. *Mark* likewiſe has many things peculiar to himſelf, not mentioned by any other Evangeliſt. A catalogue of them was made by us *(e)* formerly, though far from being compleat.

The ſame is true of St. *Luke*. As much was obſerved by *Irenaeus*, who ſays, " there " are many, and thoſe neceſſarie parts of the " Goſpel,

(e) See before p. 198.... 208.

" Gospel, which we know from *Luke* only." His brief enumeration of those things was transcribed by us into this Work *(f)* long ago. Let me also rehearse them here somewhat differently. His general introduction, the birth of *John* the Baptist, and many extraordinarie things, attending it. The *Roman* census made in *Judea*, by *Cyrenius*, or before that made by *Cyrenius*, which brought *Joseph* and *Marie* from *Nazareth* to *Bethlehem*, the mean circumstances of our Lord's nativity, the notification of it to shepherds by an angel, his circumcision, *Marie*'s purification at the temple, the prophecies of *Simeon*, and *Anna* there, our Lord's going up to *Jerusalem* at the age of twelve years. Ch. ii. The names of the Emperour and other Princes, in whose time *John* the Baptist and our Lord began to preach, and our Lord's age at that time, a genealogie different from *Matthew*. Ch. iii. In St. *Luke* are also divers miracles, not recorded elsewhere. A numerous draught of fishes. ch. v. 4. . . 9. The cures of *Marie Magdalen*, *Joanna*, wife of *Chuza*, *Herod*'s steward, and *Susanna*. ch. viii. 2. 3. giving speech to a dumb man, ch. xi. 14. a woman healed in a syna-

(f) Vol. ii. p. 357. . . 360.

a ſynagogue of an infirmity, under which ſhe had labored eighteen years. ch. xiii. 10.. 17. a man cured of the dropſie on a ſabbath day, in the houſe of a Phariſee. ch. xiv. 1. . . 4. Ten lepers cured at once. ch. xvii. 12. . . 19. the ear of *Malchus* healed. ch. xxii. 50. . . 5. the ſon of a widow of *Naim* raiſed to life, in the ſight of multitudes, when he was carried out to burial. ch. vii. 11. . . 17. a miracle of reſurrection, related by no other Evangeliſt. In him alone is the miſſion of the ſeventy diſciples. ch. x. 1. . . 20. Divers beautiful parables ſpoken by our Lord, which are not to be found elſewhere: the parable of the good Samaritan. ch. x. 25. . . 37. the parable of the loſt piece of ſilver, and the prodigal ſon. ch. xv. 8. . . 32. of the unjuſt ſteward. xvi. 1. . . 12. the rich man and *Lazarus*. 19. . . 31. the importunate widow. xviii. 1. . . 8. the Phariſee and Publican, that went up to the temple to pray. ver. 9. . . 14. To St. *Luke* alſo are peculiar our Lord's entertainment at the houſe of a Phariſee, where came in the woman that was a ſinner. ch. vii. 36. . . 50. his entertainment at the houſe of *Martha*. x. 38. . . 42. the hiſtorie of *Zaccheus*. xix. 1. . . 10. our Lord's agonie in the garden. xxii. 43. 44. the penitent

penitent thief on the croſſe. xxiii. 39. . . 43. and a particular account of the two diſciples going to *Emmaus*. xxiv. 13. . . 35.

All theſe, and many other things, which I omit, are peculiar to St. *Luke*. And did he tranſcribe many things from St. *Matthew*, and yet more from St. *Mark?*

Mill's argument, taken from the ſimilitude of ſtile and compoſition, to prove, that theſe Evangeliſts had ſeen each others writings, appears to be inſufficient. And himſelf allows, that *(g)* two authors writing upon the ſame ſubject in the Greek language may eaſily agree very much in expreſſion.

I have inſiſted the more upon this point, becauſe I think, that to ſay, the Evangeliſts abridged, and tranſcribed each other, without giving any hint of their ſo doing, is a great diſparagement to them. And it likewiſe diminiſheth the value and importance of their teſtimonie. Said Mr. *Le Clerc*, before quoted, " They

(g) Verum quidem eſt, eum eſſe linguae hujus, quae Evangeliſtis in uſu erat, Helleniſticae genium eam indolem, ut in unum ferme eundemque dicendi characterem, quoties de una eademque materia agitur, ſeſe efformet: ita ut diverſi in hoc genere ſcriptores, unum idemque aliquod argumentum particulare tractantes, ſtilo ac ſermonis tenore haud abſimili uſuri eſſent. &c. *Prol. num.* 108.

" They *(h)* ſeem to think more juſtly, who " ſay, that the firſt three Evangeliſts were un- " acquainted with each others deſign. In that " way greater weight accrues to their teſti- " monie. When witneſſes agree, who have " firſt laid their heads together, they are ſuſ- " pected. But witneſſes, who teſtify the ſame " thing ſeparatly, without knowing what o- " thers have ſaid, are juſtly credited."

This is not a new opinion, lately thought of. Nor has it been taken up by me, out of oppoſition to any. I have all my days read, and admired the firſt three Evangeliſts, as independent, and harmonious witneſſes. And I know not how to forbear ranking the other opinion among thoſe bold, as well as groundleſs aſſertions, in which critics too often indulge themſelves, without conſidering the conſequences.

(h) See Vol. x. p. 235.

The End of the firſt Volume.

I. T
occasio
ment
thors,
viour,
Times
Octav

II.
Histo
of the
sages
lumes
Christ
twelft
the Bo
bound

III.
LITY
Hist
GELIS
TAMI
Genu
the A

Publiſhed by the ſame Author.

I. THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY, Part I. or, The Facts occaſionally mentioned in the New Teſtament confirmed by Paſſages of ancient Authors, who were contemporary with our Saviour, and his Apoſtles, or lived near their Times. The third Edition, in two Volumes Octavo. Price, bound, 10*s*.

II. THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY, Part II. or, The principal Facts of the New Teſtament confirmed by Paſſages of ancient Authors. In twelve Volumes, Octavo. Containing a Hiſtorie of Chriſtian Writers to the Begining of the twelfth Century: With their Teſtimony to the Books of the New Teſtament. Price, bound, 3*l*.

III. A SUPPLEMENT TO THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY: or, A HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS, WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. In which the Evidences of the Genuinneſs of the four Goſpels, the Acts of the Apoſtles, the Epiſtles, and the Book of the

the Revelation, and the Times when they were writ, are repreſented in a Light, ſuited to all Capacities.

With Remarks and Obſervations upon every Book of the New Teſtament, uſefull for all, who deſire to underſtand the Chriſtian Religion. In three Volumes Octavo. Price, bound, 15*s*.

Note. Any Volumes may, as yet, be had ſeparate, to compleat Sets.

IV. Sermons upon various Subjects. *viz.* The Duty of Conſideration. The Unreaſonableneſs of Delays in Things of Religion. The Nature, Excellence, and Importance of moral Righteouſneſs. Wiſdom attainable by thoſe who ſeek it. Little Children brought to Chriſt. The Happineſs of having religious Parents, and other pious Relatives. The Virtue and Benefit of early Piety. A future State provable by Reaſon. The Goſpel the true Way of Salvation. The good Exerciſe of Faith. The Power of Chriſt's Doctrine. A Recommendation of Things virtuous, lovely, and of good Report. The Importance of our Words. The Difficulty of governing the Tongue. The Benefit of fearing always.